DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 002 95 EC 072 444

AUTHOR Fisher, Steven D.; And Others
TITLE Post Secondary Programs for the Deaf: III. Internal Views. Research Report No. 67.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Research, Development, and Demonstration Center in Education of Handicapped Children.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO 332189
PUB DATE Sep 74
GRANT OEG-09-332189-4533(032)
NOTE 225p.; For related documents, see EC 072 440, EC 072 441, and EC 072 451

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$10.78 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Aurally Handicapped; Counselors; *Deaf; Exceptional Child Education; *Interviews; Post Secondary Education; *Program Evaluation; Students; Teachers; *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

The third of six monographs on three postsecondary vocational technical programs for deaf students reports evaluations by deaf students, preparatory teachers, program counselors, regular class teachers, interpreters, and the administrator from each program. Interview methods and results are described. Data are thought to support such conclusions as the following: that few jobs were chosen for which training was not offered in the technical/vocational setting; that program counselors found their roles insufficiently defined in relation to the students and other staff members; that interpreters were in the unique position of having considerable contact with everyone involved in the programs; and that a consolidation of admissions, placement, and followup function was needed. Appendixes contain interview forms for each group interviewed. (GW)

ED 107092

RESEARCH REPORT #67

Project No. 332189
Grant No. OE-09-332189-4533 (032)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# POST SECONDARY PROGRAMS FOR THE DEAF: III. Internal Views

Steven D. Fisher, Donald F. Moores, Mary Jane P. Harlow
University of Minnesota

Research, Development and Demonstration
Center in Education of Handicapped Children
Minneapolis, Minnesota

September 1974

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Center of Research, Development and Demonstration in Education of Handicapped Children, Department of Psychoeducational Studies, University of Minnesota. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represented official position of the Bureau of Edueation for the Handicapped.

EC 072 444

Department of Health, Education and Welfare
U.S. Office of Education
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION CENTER
IN EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Department of Psychoeducational Studies
Pattee Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

The University of Minnesota Research, Development and Demonstration Center in Education of Handicapped Children has been established to concentrate on intervention strategies and materials which develop and improve language and communication skills in young handicapped children.

The long term objective of the Center is to improve the language and communication abilities of handicapped children by means of identification of linguistically and potentially linguistically handicapped children, development and evaluation of intervention strategies with young handicapped children and dissemination of findings and products of benefit to young handicapped children.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the following people at each program who were especially helpful during the research conducted in 1973: Linda Donnels, Peter Wuescher, Douglas Wells, Michael Weldon and Roy Pierce, Delgado Junior College; Stanley Traxler, Alice Burch, Lucy Fridell, William Davis and Steven King, Seattle Community College; Robert Lauritsen, Irene Domonkos, Roger Reddan and John Bachman, St. Paul Technical Vocational Institute; along with all the interpreters, preparatory program teachers, technical vocational teachers, counselors and current students at the various participating programs whose cooperation facilitated complete data collection.

Thanks are extended to Audrey Buhr, Karen Pugh, DeAnna Gehant and Cathy Mattson for their assistance with the preparation of the monographs.

Appreciation and thanks are also due to the following students in the education of the hearing-impaired program at the University of Minnesota who participated in data analysis: Kathy Nelson, Ann Bauleke and Linda Ritchie.

Very special thanks go to Sue Dingman for her extensive work collecting data in Seattle and New Orleans, to Diane Holte whose assistance in organizing and analyzing the data was invaluable to us, and to Douglas Burke for his suggestions concerning the development of questionnaires and interview forms.

The investigators wish to thank the Minnesota, Washington and Louisiana Departments of Manpower Services of the U. S. Department of Labor for testing many of the students included in the project. In particular, appreciation is extended to Edward Schultz of the Minnesota office for his assistance in preparing General Aptitude Test Battery testing contracts in all three states.

We extend our appreciation to Dr. Ben Hoffmeyer, Headmaster of the American School for the Deaf for granting us free access to the American School's Historical Library and to Jane Wilson, American School librarian for her assistance.

Finally, this project could not have been undertaken without the

cooperation of hundreds of parents, vocational rehabilitation counselors, young deaf people and employers. We hope in return this project will have made a contribution to them by bringing the current occupational status of young deaf people into focus and recommending courses of action designed to evaluate their status and permit them to become even more productive members of society.

## Foreword

The University of Minnesota Research, Development and Demonstration Center in Education of Handicapped Children became involved in the evaluation of post-secondary programs in July 1972, several years after the three programs in consideration had been established. The charge to the Center was to develop, in cooperation with the programs in New Orleans, St. Paul, and Seattle, mechanisms by which to identify those components necessary for the development and maintenance of successful post-secondary vocational technical programs for the hearing impaired students.

A special debt of gratitude is owed to the three programs for their willingness to cooperate with an "outside" evaluation team rather than follow the more traditional mode of self-evaluation. We hope that whatever inconvenience the programs may have experienced will be compensated for by the results of the evaluation.

The evaluation was made possible through the cooperation of two federal agencies, the Bureau of Education of the Handicapped (BEH) and Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS). We gratefully acknowledge the support and advice of Max Mueller of BEH and Edna Adler and Dene Reed of SRS. Of primary importance, of course, has been the interest and support of Boyce Williams, Chief of the Department of Communication Disorders at SRS. It is safe to say that without his efforts the substantial gains made in vocational technical training for the deaf would have been of a more limited nature.

Appreciation is extended to Professor Moores and Mary Jane Harlow, whose guidance and assistance were invaluable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Acknowledgments | i |
| Foreword | iii |
| Table of Contents | v |
| List of Tables | vi |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Methods | 5 |
| Results | 10 |
| Discussion | 63 |
| Summary | 69 |
| References | 70a |
| Appendices | 71 |
| Interview Forms | |
| Appendix A - Young Deaf Adult Form (Current Student) | 71 |
| Appendix B - Preparatory Program Teacher Form | 77 |
| Appendix C - School Counselor Form | 86 |
| Appendix D - Teacher Form | 99 |
| Appendix E - Interpreter Form | 106 |
| Appendix F - Administrator Form | 115 |
| Appendix G - Current Students (Tables 21-27) | 131 |
| Appendix H - Preparatory Program Teachers (Tables 28-29) | 142 |
| Appendix I - Counseling (Tables 30-34) | 145 |
| Appendix J - Teachers (Tables 35-51) | 151 |
| Appendix K - Interpreters (Tables 52-53) | 191 |

LIST OF TABLES


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Occupation Current Students Desire 10 Years From Present | 11 |
| 2. | Current Students' Plans Upon Leaving School | 13 |
| 3. | Subjects Taught by the Preparatory Program Teachers | 15 |
| 4. | Educational Levels of Preparatory Teachers | 15 |
| 5. | Preparatory Teachers Experience with the Deaf Prior to Current Employment | 16 |
| 6. | Preparatory Teachers Teaching Experience with Students Other than Deaf Students | 17 |
| 7. | Stated Requirements for Acquisition of Preparatory Teacher Position | 18 |
| 8. | Preparatory Teachers' Rating of Self as Teacher of the Deaf | 19 |
| 9. | Educational Level and Training of Program Counselors | 24 |
| 10. | Counselors' Prior Experience with the Deaf and Hearing | 25 |
| 11. | Stated Requirements for Acquisition of Counselor Position | 26 |
| 12. | Test Measures Utilized to Place Students | 27 |
| 13. | Suggested Changes in Placement Procedures | 29 |
| 14. | Counselors' Descriptions of Program Follow-Up Procedures | 38 |
| 15. | Suggested Improvements in the Follow-up Procedures | 38 |
| 16. | Technical-Vocational Teachers' Mode of Communication with Deaf Students in the Classroom | 40 |
| 17. | Degrees Held by Program Administrators | 48 |
| 18. | Course of Study Available in the Preparatory Programs | 54 |
| 19. | Test Measures Utilized for Student Placement | 54 |
| 20. | Hiring Policies for Staff Members as Given by Administrators | 59 |
| 21. | Why Current Students Would Prefer to go to School with both Hearing and Deaf Students | 132 |
| 22. | Why it Makes No Difference to Current Students Whether They go to School with Hearing, Deaf or Both | 134 |
| 23. | Why Current Student Would Prefer to go to School with Deaf Students | 134 |
| 24. | Why Current Students Like the Idea of a Vocational and Technical School for Young Deaf People Who Do Not go to a School Such as Gallaudet | 135 |
| 25. | Reasons for Current Student Dissatisfaction with Training | 138 |
| 26. | Kind of Work Students Will Look for When They Leave the School | 139 |

27. Description of the Summer or Part Time Job Students Have Had . . . . . 140
28. Improvements in the Preparatory Program Preparatory Teachers Would Make . . . . . 143
29. Additional Comments . . . . . 144
30. Counselors' Descriptions of Weaknesses in Present Referral Procedures . . . . . 146
31. Suggested Improvements in the Counselor/Administrator Relationship . . . . . 147
32. Counselors' Descriptions of Placement Procedures . . . . . 148
33. Suggested Ways to Improve Employer/Employee Relationships . 149
34. Additional Comments . . . . . 150
35. Subjects Taught by Technical-Vocational Teachers Interviewed 152
36. If Teacher Slows Down Teaching Pace for the Benefit of the Deaf Students How the Others React . . . . . 154
37. What Teacher Considers to be the Strengths of Teaching an Integrated Class . . . . . 155
38. What Teacher You Consider to be the Weaknesses of Teaching an Integrated Class . . . . . 158
39. Improvements in the Classroom Situation Teacher Would Suggest . . . . . 161
40. Why Teacher Feels the Deaf Student Does Not Have Adequate Comprehension of the Subject Matter . . . . . 164
41. In What Way Interpreter Aid is Valuable . . . . . 166
42. Reasons Teachers Seek Out Interpreters . . . . . 169
43. Reasons Interpreters Contact Teacher . . . . . 172
44. Improvements in Teacher/Interpreter Cooperation and Communication Teacher Would Suggest . . . . . 174
45. Reasons Teachers Contact Counselors . . . . . 176
46. Reasons Counselors Contact Teacher . . . . . 178
47. Improvements in Teacher/Counselor Communication and Cooperation Teacher Would Suggest . . . . . 180
48. Reasons Administrators Contact Teacher . . . . . 182
49. Reasons Counselors Contact Administrators . . . . . 183
50. Improvements Teacher Would Suggest in Teacher/Administrator Cooperation and Communication . . . . . 184
51. Additional Information and Comments . . . . . 186
52. Subjects Interpreted at Each Program . . . . . 192
53. Additional Comments . . . . . 193

# INTRODUCTION

## Background

The presens paper represents the third of a series of six monographs produced as a result of an evaluation of three federally funded post-secondary vocational technical programs for deaf students. The programs are:

1) Delgado Community College, New Orleans, Louisiana;
2) Seattle Community College, Seattle, Washington;
3) Technical Vocational Institute, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Monograph I, Post Secondary Programs for the Deaf: Introduction and Overview, contains a complete description of the three programs.

The study was designed with the following objectives:

(1) To provide developing post-secondary programs with guidelines for establishing programs for the deaf.

(2) To determine as precisely as possible the nature of the three demonstration projects in relation to:
   a) Population served
   b) Courses of study offered
   c) Supportive services provided
   d) Cost of services

(3) To determine the effectiveness of the type of post-secondary programming offered by the three demonstration projects in:
   a) Course success
   b) Employment success
   c) Attrition
   d) Comparison of student and non-student success

(4) To consider student characteristics in an attempt to derive implications for specific instructional vocational procedures.

The objectives may be seen as encompassing two components. The first deals with the three existing federally funded demonstration programs. Formative process evaluation was conducted as a means of increasing the effectiveness of ongoing programs. The final outcome of the project, based on the summative evaluation of the demonstration programs, is concerned with establishing guidelines for new programs.

In addition to program descriptions, Monograph I contains a complete statement of the problem, review of the literature, and summary of previous investigations on the vocational status of the

deaf. The series was developed to be read sequentially and the reader is advised to be familiar with the contents of Monograph I and II before reading the present report.

## ORGANIZATION OF MONOGRAPH SERIES

Procedures are spelled out in detail in the appropriate sections. Including the present report, six monographs have been developed and comprise the total package. The monographs are as follows:

I Introduction and Overview
II External Views of Programs
III Internal Views of Programs
IV Empirical Data Analysis
V Follow-up Data Analysis
VI Guidelines

Monograph I: Introduction and Overview

This report is divided into the following categories:

1. Introduction and Statement of the Problem
2. Review of the Literature
3. Program Descriptions
4. Procedures

Monograph II: External Views of Programs

Material in this monograph is based on results obtained by two sets of interviews and two sets of questionnaires as follows:

1. Interviews of Former Students Now Employed
2. Interviews of Employees' Supervisors
3. Parent Questionnaires
4. Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor Questionnaires

For each category the results are treated separately for each of the three programs (Delgado, Seattle, TVI) as well as on a general basis across programs. The same procedure was followed for all subsequent monographs.

Monograph III: Internal Views of Programs

Material in this section is based on interviews with the following categories of respondents:

1. Current Students
2. Deaf Program Staff
   a) Administrators
   b) Counselors
   c) Preparatory Program Teachers
   d) Interpreters
3. Technical Vocational Teachers-College Training Staff.

Monograph IV: Empirical Data Analysis.

Empirical data analysis was conducted on two groups, Former Students and Current Students:

1. Former Students
   a) Stanford Achievement Test
   b) General Aptitude Test Battery
   c) IPAT
   d) Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale

2. Current Students
   a) Stanford Achievement Test
   b) General Aptitude Test Battery
   c) IPAT
   d) Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale

Monograph V: Follow-up Data Analysis.

The follow-up data consist of information on former students arranged in the following categories:

1. Areas of Training
2. Former Student Status
   a) Graduates
   b) Goal Completions
   c) Withdrawals
3. Job Placement
4. Geographic Origin

Monograph VI: Guidelines and Summary.

This monograph provides guidelines for the development and monitoring of effective vocational technical programs for the deaf within ongoing programs for hearing students. A summary of the complete study is also provided.

Presentation of Internal Views

Internal views of the programs were gathered from six sources: deaf students, preparatory teachers, program counselors, regular class teachers, interpreters, and the administrator from each of the three programs for the deaf. As will be seen in the report, each category represents a different perspective toward each of the programs and each provides unique insights. In the authors' opinion, in the aggregate they provide a mechanism for evaluation of the

programs through input from individuals of different backgrounds, all of whom are factors in program success or failure. Consideration was given to the inclusion of representatives from one other category which would have consisted of students with normal hearing enrolled in classes with the deaf students. Because of sampling difficulties and the unlikelihood of obtaining interviewees truly representative of the student bodies as a whole, it was decided that the reliability of information gathered on the basis of small number of interviews would be in question.

## METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Interviews: Students, Program Staff and Technical/Vocational Instructors

Data were gathered from students, program staff and technical/vocational instructors by means of personal interviews. Three interviewers interviewed 76 current students, 9 preparatory program teachers, 8 program counselors, 77 technical/vocational instructors, 31 interpreters, and 3 program administrators. Interview forms were developed through discussion among members of the research team during the winter of 1972-73.

The young deaf adult interview form was the same form used to interview former students now employed (Appendix A). Four sections of the form appropriate to the situation of current students were used:

I Vital information
V Aspirations
VI Students
VII Satisfaction with Training

The interview form was designed to elicit information on student aspirations, plans upon leaving school, and satisfaction with training.

The preparatory program teacher interview form (Appendix B) consisted of eight pages containing the following sections:

I General Information
II Education
III Employment
IV Communication and Interaction with Students
V Subject Comprehension
VI Teacher/Interpreter Interaction
VII Teacher/Counselor Interaction
VIII Teacher/Administrator Interaction
IX General Information About the Preparatory Program
X Additional Comments

The form was designed to elicit general information on program staff interaction and specific information on the status and contributions of the preparatory programs to the respective programs.

The program counselor interview form (Appendix C) consisted of 12 pages containing the following sections:

I General Information
II Education
III Employment
IV Referral Procedures
V Student Placement within the Program
VI Communication with Students
VII Interaction with Students
VIII Interaction with Parents
IX Interaction with Preparatory Program Teachers
X Interaction with Technical/Vocational Teachers
XI Interaction with Interpreters
XII Interaction with Administrators
XIII Student Placement
XIV Withdrawals
XV Follow-Up
XVI Additional Comments
XVII School Relations

The form was designed to elicit general information on program staff interaction and specific information on the role of the counselor in preparing students for training and employment.

The technical/vocational teacher interview form (Appendix D) consisted of six pages containing the following sections:

I General Information
II Employment
III Communication and Interaction
IV Subject Comprehension
V Teacher/Interpreter Interaction
VI Teacher/Counselor Interaction
VII Teacher/Administrator Interaction
VIII Additional Comments

The form was designed to elicit information on teachers' views of deaf student capabilities and their interaction with hearing students and teachers in the technical/vocational classroom.

The interpreter interview form (Appendix E) consisted of 8 pages containing the following sections:

I General Information
II Education
III Communication and Interaction
IV Interpreting Skills
V Subject Comprehension
VI Interpreter/Teacher Interaction
VII Interpreter/Counselor Interaction
VIII Interpreter/Administrator Interaction
IX Additional Comments

The form was designed to elicit information on deaf student performance and interaction in the hearing classroom, the interpreter's role in communication among deaf students, hearing students and teachers, and interpreter assessment of overall communication between deaf students and others.

The administrator interview form (Appendix F) consisted of 15 pages containing the following sections:

I General Information
II Education
III Previous Employment
IV Current Employment
V Student Recruitment
VI Admissions
VII Student Financial Support
VIII Medical Services
IX Preparatory Program
X Student Placement within the Program
XI Communication and Interaction with Students
XII Interaction with Parents
XIII Administrator/Counselor Interaction
XIV Administrator/Preparatory Program Teacher Interaction
XV Administrator/Technical Vocational Teacher Interaction
XVI Administrator/Interpreter Interaction
XVII Staff Recruitment
XVIII Student Placement
XVIV Withdrawals
XX Follow-Up
XXI Deaf Program Costs
XXII The Program within the School
XXIII Professional Organization Membership

The form was designed to elicit information concerning overall program functioning, administrator/staff/student interaction, and program direction.

Sample. Selection of current students for interviewing was based upon the availability of complete data on the following test measures:

Stanford Achievement Test
General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB)
"g" Score of GATB
Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale
Moores Cloze Test

Twenty-seven students were interviewed at Delgado; 28 at Seattle; and 21 at St. Paul TVI.

Interviewing of technical/vocational instructors was based upon the presence of deaf students within their classrooms. Since time limitations prevented the interviewing of all teachers, it was decided to interview approximately 25 instructors at each school. Twenty-seven teachers were interviewed at Delgado; 25 at Seattle; and 25 at TVI.

The small number of individuals on program staffs made it possible to interview nearly everyone within the allotted time period. In some cases, illness or absence prevented the interviewing of interpreters. All administrators, counselors, and preparatory program teachers were interviewed.

Data collection. Interviewing at the Delgado program began April 23, 1973 and was completed within a two-week period. Interviewing at the Seattle program began May 14, 1973 and was completed within a two-week period. Interviewing of current students at the TVI program was completed in March, 1973 because of the proximity of the program to researchers. Staff members and technical/vocational teachers at TVI were interviewed during the first week of June, 1973.

Treatment of Data. The data collected and presented here are of two types: quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative data refer to data coded for tabulation and reporting. Qualitative data refer to anecdotal information gathered.

Interviews of Students, Program Staff and Technical/Vocational Instructors. Interview procedure was identical in all cases. The interviewee was first informed of the interviewer's name and that he was from the University of Minnesota RD&D Center. The purpose of the visit was then explained--that the Center was conducting an evaluation of the model post-secondary programs for the deaf and desired information and opinions regarding program training and functioning. The interviewee was informed that all responses obtained would be considered confidential and that, once the form was completed, he was welcome to read it and make any changes and/or corrections he wished. The interviewee was also informed that he was under no obligation to provide information and did not have to submit to the interview if he did not wish to.

Interviews with deaf individuals were conducted in a form of communication desired by the interviewee. The majority of communications involved sign language, fingerspelling, speech and speechreading.

# RESULTS

## Students

Vital Data. The interview sample consisted of 43 males and 33 females currently attending one of the three model post-secondary programs for the hearing-impaired. The age range was from 18 to 29 years with a mean of 22.47 years. Two students were married and had no children. Both spouses were deaf. Of the 74 single students, 5 were engaged, 12 were going steady, 47 were neither engaged nor going steady, and 10 gave no response.

Data on the hearing status of the students were collected from file data folders. The data, however, were inconsistent, and it was not possible to obtain accurate estimates of hearing losses. Hearing losses appeared to range from hard-of-hearing to profound. Most interviews, conducted in the mode of communication desired by the interviewees, were accomplished through a combination of speech, speechreading, sign language and fingerspelling.

Aspirations. Current students were asked what job they would like ten years into the future and whether or not they thought they would have that job. Of the occupations listed (Table 1), only six could be considered outside the realm of post-secondary course offerings--teacher, teacher of the deaf, counselor for the deaf, social worker/psychologist for the deaf, and housewife. Thirty-seven of the 76 interviewees believed they would have the job they wanted; 28 were not sure; 11 gave no response; and none said they would not have the job they wanted. Most frequent choices of occupations among males were: graphic arts/printing (12) and cabinetmaking/carpentry (6). Most frequent choice among the females was general office practice (20) which includes keypunching, clerk-typist, office machines, etc. Fifty-two of 76 students thought that more training would be required for their future occupation.

Program and Training. Of the 76 students interviewed, 52 preferred to attend school with both hearing and hearing-impaired peers. Fourteen said it made no difference to them; 10 preferred deaf peers; and none preferred hearing peers only.

Table 1

Occupation Current Students Desire 10 Years from Present

| DELGADO | | SEATTLE | | TVI | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Occupation | Number | Occupation | Number | Occupati | |
| Doesn't know | 3 | General office practice (clerk typist, keypunch, etc.) | 4 | General (busi keypu | |
| Keypuncher | 3 | Undecided | 3 | Don't kn | |
| Cabinetmaking/carpentry | 3 | Carpentry/marine carpentry | 3 | Tool and | |
| Drafting | 2 | Welder | 2 | Housewif | |
| Printer | 2 | Baker | 1 | Factory, | |
| Post office letter sorting machine operator | 2 | Mechanic or post office worker | 1 | or ho | |
| Photography | 2 | Horologist | 1 | Farmer o | |
| General office practice | 2 | Medical lab technology | 1 | Offset p | |
| Teacher | 1 | Teacher of the deaf | 1 | Printing | |
| Electrician | 1 | Cosmetology/hairdresser | 1 | Graphic | |
| Fashion design | 1 | Welding or machine shop operator | 1 | Electro- nolog appli | |
| Cooking | 1 | Photography | 1 | | |
| Commercial artist | 1 | Designing and drafting/sculpture | 1 | | |
| Office machines | 1 | Library work | 1 | | |
| Data processing | 1 | Printing | 1 | Refriger | |
| Computer programmer | 1 | Counselor for the deaf | 1 | Sheef me | |
| Commercial arts and crafts (pottery, etc.) | 1 | Lithography/graphic production | 1 | | |
| Business administration | 1 | Social worker/psychologist for the deaf | 1 | | |
| Law enforcement | 1 | Chemistry lab technician | 1 | | |
| Offset and photography printing | 1 | Own trailer building shop or work for commercial truck company | 1 | | |
| | | Diesel mechanic | 1 | | |

Table 1

Occupation Current Students Desire 10 Years from Present

| | Number | SEATTLE Occupation | Number | TVI Occupation | Number |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 3 | General office practice (clerk | | General office practice | |
| | 3 | typist, keypunch, etc.) | 4 | (business machines, | |
| entry | 3 | Undecided | 3 | keypunch, typing) | 7 |
| | 2 | Carpentry/marine carpentry | 3 | Don't know | 3 |
| | 2 | Welder | 2 | Tool and die making | 2 |
| sorting | | Baker | 1 | Housewife | 1 |
| r | 2 | Mechanic or post office worker | 1 | Factory, assembly, office, | |
| | 2 | Horologist | 1 | or hospital work | 1 |
| ctice | 2 | Medical lab technology | 1 | Farmer or printer | 1 |
| | 1 | Teacher of the deaf | 1 | Offset printing | 1 |
| | 1 | Cosmetology/hairdresser | 1 | Printing or photography | 1 |
| | 1 | Welding or machine shop operator | 1 | Graphic arts work | 1 |
| | 1 | Photography | 1 | Electro-mechanical tech- | |
| | 1 | Designing and drafting/sculpture | 1 | nology--electrical | |
| | 1 | Library work | 1 | appliance serviceman | 1 |
| | 1 | Printing | 1 | Refrigeration serviceman | 1 |
| r | 1 | Counselor for the deaf | 1 | Sheet metal worker | 1 |
| d crafts | | Lithography/graphic production | 1 | | |
| | 1 | Social worker/psychologist for | | | |
| ation | 1 | the deaf | 1 | | |
| | 1 | Chemistry lab technician | 1 | | |
| aphy | | Own trailer building shop or work | | | |
| | 1 | for commercial truck company | 1 | | |
| | | Diesel mechanic | 1 | | |

Those who preferred both hearing and deaf peers gave a variety of reasons for their opinions, among the most common of which were: 1) hearing students can help the deaf to better communication; 2) hearing students can aid the deaf student with class work; 3) it gives deaf students a chance to learn interpersonal skills with hearing students that will be necessary on the job and outside the school.

Those who preferred to attend school with deaf students typically stated that it was easier to communicate with deaf students and difficult to communicate with the hearing.

Those to whom it made no difference generally gave responses that mentioned such aspects as 1) communicating and getting along with both kinds of people and 2) everybody is equal.

Appendix G (Tables 21, 22, and 23) provides a complete listing of students' reasons for their preference of peers.

Interviewees were asked the question: "Do you like the idea of a technical and vocational school for young hearing-impaired people who do not go to a school such as Gallaudet?" Of the 76 students, 57 liked the idea of such programs; 16 were not sure; and three disapproved.

Responses from those who approved of the programs generally mentioned: 1) the programs provide the training necessary to obtain employment; 2) the programs provide the staff (interpreters, tutors, etc.) necessary to help the deaf student; and 3) Gallaudet does not provide the type of training the post-secondary programs provide (Appendix G, Table 24).

Of the three students who did not approve of the concept of technical/vocational programs for the hearing-impaired, two mentioned that Gallaudet had more majors, and one liked the idea of the programs only if the teachers were deaf too.

Of the current students, 67 indicated they were satisfied with their training; eight said they were not satisfied; and one had mixed feelings (Responses of those dissatisfied are presented in Appendix G, Table 25).

Students' Plans Upon Leaving School. Almost 1/4 of the students reported plans to go on to college upon leaving school (Table 2), a surprisingly large proportion, given the stated goals of the programs. For those planning to go directly to work, the types of position desired (Appendix G, Table 26) were similar to the types of training offered in the programs.

Table 2. Current Students' Plans Upon Leaving School

| | Delgado | Seattle | TVI | Total | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Go to work | 8 | 19 | 17 | 44 | 57.90 |
| Go to college | 10 | 6 | 2 | 18 | 23.68 |
| Undecided | 9 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 15.79 |
| Other | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2.63 |
| No response | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | 27 | 28 | 21 | 76 | 100.00% |

Interviewees were asked what jobs they had held previous to and during attendance at one of the programs. Jobs most commonly held (Appendix G, Table 27) included: janitorial (7), dishwasher (5), clerical work (6), and printing (4). Fifty-one of 76 students had held part-time or summer employment; 20 had not; 1 gave no response; and 4 had held full-time jobs.

Preparatory Teachers

General Information. Nine preparatory program teachers were interviewed, three at each program. One individual in the Delgado program acted as preparatory program administrator; answers concerning his preparatory program functions will be found in this section. Seven of the nine teachers were hearing, with Seattle and TVI each having one deaf teacher. Courses taught by the preparatory program teachers are designed to teach the basic skills necessary for the deaf student's survival in a technical/vocational environment. Courses taught in each program are listed in Table 3.

Education. All nine teachers had received Bachelor's degrees and three had earned Master's degrees (Table 4). Three teachers had acquired interpreting and communication skills at a school for the deaf; two had acquired them on the job; two had acquired them in formal

settings (college and speech and hearing center); and one had learned through his family.

Employment. Eight individuals had had experience working with the deaf before their current employment, and six had experience in teaching the deaf before current employment. Experience ranged from formal (rehabilitation work, teaching, interpreting) to informal (Sunday school, summer camps, offices in organizations for the deaf). (Table 5). Five of the preparatory program teachers also had experience teaching other than deaf students (Table 6).

Most of the teachers became aware of the availability of their present position through the program administrator who, in most cases, initiated the contact. Stated requirements for the preparatory teacher positions are reported in Table 7.

Communication and Interaction with Students. The preparatory program teachers reported the use of multiple modes of communication with the deaf students in their classes. All the teachers used speech and speechreading and fingerspelling, eight used sign language, seven used gestures, six used writing, and two used other means such as sketches, diagrams, and audio-visual aids. Eight of the teachers thought they communicated adequately with between 90 and 100% of the deaf students; one indicated a percentage of between 75 and 80%. Six of the nine teachers felt they understood most of the deaf students' communication, and three thought they understood all their communication. In terms of speech alone, five of the nine teachers felt they understood most of the deaf students' speech. Two understood some of it; 1 understood all of it; and 1 gave no response.

When asked what they considered to be their strengths in communicating with the deaf, the teachers mentioned empathy, good rapport, patience in communication, interest in the deaf, able to get across any type of message with any type of communication, gesturing comes naturally, liking to talk with people, knowledge of sign language and Ameslan; able to understand deaf student's message and able to explain things at different levels. Teachers considered their weaknesses in communication to be: not able to understand 100% of what student says; not enough control of signing and fingerspelling

Table 3

Subjects Taught by the Preparatory Program Teachers

| Program | | |
|---|---|---|
| Delgado: | 1. | English and Sign Language |
| | 2. | Vocational Survey (assessment for prepartory training--printing, woodworking, welding, drafting) |
| | 3. | Preparatory Program administrator |
| Seattle: | 1. | Reading |
| | 2. | Math |
| | 3. | Vocational/technical language |
| TVI: | 1. | Communication-Reading; Personal Management; Family Life; English |
| | 2. | Math, Pre-Physics (Formulas), team teaching seminar--Personal Management II. |
| | 3. | Communication and Scienrce |

Table 4

Educational Levels of Preparatory Teachers

| Program | Bachelor's Degree | Master's Degree |
|---|---|---|
| Delgado | | |
| 1 | Industrial Education | Guidance & Counseling |
| 2 | English Education | |
| 3 | Business Education & Speech | Educational Administration |
| Seattle | | |
| 1 | English | Administrative Supervision (one year coursework in deaf education) |
| 2 | Liberal Arts | |
| 3 | Electrical Engineering | |
| TVI | | |
| 1 | English | |
| 2 | Chemistry | |
| 3 | History, Deaf Education | |

Table 5

Preparatory Teachers' Experience with the Deaf Prior to Current Employme

| Program | Work | Teaching |
|---|---|---|
| Delgado | 1) 5 years experience with multiply handicapped in rehabilitation center.<br>2) teaching night adult education course for the deaf; done research on sign language collecting information for pilot study; helped to establish parents organization to get classes for deaf children in the area; interpret for church groups and other functions.<br>3) rehabilitation center work. | 1) none<br>2) rehabilitation center<br>3) no response |
| Seattle | 1) none<br>2) 2 years as a houseparent and playground director at school for the deaf; printing and linotype instructor at school for the deaf; academic teacher and printing instructor at school for the deaf; graphic arts instructor, school for the deaf.<br>3) full-time interpreter at university for 3 years; full time interpreter in program for 3 years. | 1) substituting in public<br>1 summer's substitutio<br>speech center as teach<br>in deaf adult service<br>2) academic teacher and<br>school for the deaf fo<br>ing and linotype insti<br>the deaf for 13 years<br>and printing instructo<br>deaf for 1 year; grap<br>for 4 years at school<br>3) none |
| TVI | 1) officer in many different organizations for the deaf; the deaf come to me for help with their problems.<br>2) dean of students for 1 year at school for the deaf; principal for 2 years at school for the deaf.<br>3) deaf relatives; teach Sunday School to deaf children, summer camps. | 1) 3 years teaching at s<br>summer camps.<br>2) 2 years teaching at s<br>1 summer and 1 fall s<br>the deaf.<br>3) none |

Table 5

reparatory Teachers' Experience with the Deaf Prior to Current Employment

| k | Teaching |
|---|---|
| 5 years experience with multiply handicapped in rehabilitation center. teaching night adult education course for the deaf; done research on sign language collecting information for pilot study; helped to establish parents organization to get classes for deaf children in the area; interpret for church groups and other functions. rehabilitation center work. | 1) none<br>2) rehabilitation center work<br>3) no response |
| none<br>2 years as a houseparent and playground director at school for the deaf; printing and linotype instructor at school for the deaf; academic teacher and printing instructor at school for the deaf; graphic arts instructor, school for the deaf. full-time interpreter at university for 3 years; full time interpreter in program for 3 years. | 1) substituting in public elementary schools; 1 summer's substitution at hearing and speech center as teacher and social worker in deaf adult services.<br>2) academic teacher and athletic work at school for the deaf for one year; printing and linotype instructor at school for the deaf for 13 years; academic teacher and printing instructor at school for the deaf for 1 year; graphic arts instructor for 4 years at school for the deaf.<br>3) none |
| officer in many different organizations for the deaf; the deaf come to me for help with their problems. dean of students for 1 year at school for the deaf; principal for 2 years at school for the deaf. deaf relatives; teach Sunday School to deaf children, summer camps. | 1) 3 years teaching at school for the deaf; summer camps.<br>2) 2 years teaching at school for the deaf; 1 summer and 1 fall session at school for the deaf.<br>3) none |

Table 6

Preparatory Teachers' Teaching Experience with Students Other than Deaf Stud

| Program | |
|---|---|
| Delgado | 1) Taught sign language to hearing people for 1 year.<br>2) Taught 1 1/2 years with Veterans Administration as manual arts and at rehabilitation center for 3 years; helped handicapped, tric patients to regain manual skills.<br>3) no response |
| Seattle | 1) one year teaching 4th grade hearing children.<br>2) none<br>3) none |
| TVI | 1) none<br>2) 5 years teaching hearing students; 1 semester teaching night s and 1 quarter of day school.<br>3) Teach photography to hearing students every spring quarter at |

Table 6

ratory Teachers' Teaching Experience with Students Other than Deaf Students

1) Taught sign language to hearing people for 1 year.
2) Taught 1 1/2 years with Veterans Administration as manual arts therapist and at rehabilitation center for 3 years; helped handicapped, and psychiatric patients to regain manual skills.
3) no response

1) one year teaching 4th grade hearing children.
2) none
3) none

1) none
2) 5 years teaching hearing students; 1 semester teaching night school at TVI and 1 quarter of day school.
3) Teach photography to hearing students every spring quarter at TVI.

Table 7

Stated Requirements for Acquisition of Preparatory Teacher Position

| Program | |
|---|---|
| Delgado | 1) a number of years experience in education and rehabilitation specifically to the deaf; vocational evaluation experience.<br>2) bachelors degree; communication skills (signs & fingerspelli of industrial or vocational survey arts.<br>3) bachelors degree i: English or related area and manual commu |
| Seattle | 1) first came as a tutor; then about 9 months later began teachi time.<br>2) bachelor of arts degree; five years experience in teaching th ficiency in sign language.<br>3) bachelor's degree, communication skills (signs) |
| TVI | 1) 3 years teaching experience; knowledge of communication skil secondary education.<br>2) teaching certificate, vocational certificate, experience in deaf, total communication skills.<br>3) Had to have more than 10-15 years of experience in a field o chemistry and photography. |

Table 7

Stated Requirements for Acquisition of Preparatory Teacher Position

1) a number of years experience in education and rehabilitation with service specifically to the deaf; vocational evaluation experience;
2) bachelors degree; communication skills (signs & fingerspelling); knowledge of industrial or vocational survey arts.
3) bachelors degree in English or related area and manual communication skills.

1) first came as a tutor; then about 9 months later began teaching math full-time.
2) bachelor of arts degree; five years experience in teaching the deaf; proficiency in sign language.
3) bachelor's degree, communication skills (signs)

1) 3 years teaching experience; knowledge of communication skills; degree in secondary education.
2) teaching certificate; vocational certificate, experience in teaching the deaf, total communication skills.
3) Had to have more than 10-15 years of experience in a field other than teaching chemistry and photography:

ability; difficulty in communicating with students with little hearing and few signing skills; difficulty with receptive communication; and lack of hearing.

Seven of the nine preparatory program teachers rated themselves as excellent or above average teachers of the deaf (Table 8). When asked what they considered to be their strengths in teaching the deaf,

Table 8

Preparatory Teachers' Rating of Self as Teacher of the Deaf

| | Delgado | Seattle | TVI | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Excellent | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Above average | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| Average | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Below average | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No response | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

the teachers tended to center on such aspects as knowledge of subject matter, ability to get subject matter across, positive attitude about deafness, knowledge of deaf people, and willingness to adapt methods and content to fit the students. Weaknesses mentioned were lack in communication skills and lack of formal teacher training.

Seven of eight preparatory teachers responded that the deaf students brought their problems to them. One gave no response. Academic problems most frequently brought to the teachers generally concerned language (English and reading) and math. Six of the eight teachers said that deaf students sometimes brought family problems to them and that these problems generally involved lack of communication between parents and students (parents not understanding, money misunderstandings, conflict about major area of study). Social problems mentioned were with drugs, inability to get along with another deaf individual, sex problems (boy/girl relations, sex information), automobile problems (license, accidents, insurance), and money problems. Other problems included difficulties with Vocational Rehabilitation, academic or vocational problems, personality conflicts, medical and finance problems, and housing difficulties. Most teachers (7) indicated they referred such problems to the program counselors

if the problem was not easily solved or not of an extremely personal nature.

The preparatory teachers were asked if they felt the deaf students understood the subject matter adequately. Responses were mixed with four saying they did understand; two that they did not; two saying it depended on the individual and the subject matter; and one gave no response. Those who felt the deaf students did not understand reported the deaf student has no concept of what the world of work is like and has no idea why different subjects will lead to a future job; deaf students do not understand when in a regular class and that is why they need preparatory classes; and there is a need for "hands-on" instruction rather than textbook preparation.

Teacher Interaction with Other Staff. Most teachers met on a daily basis with the interpreters in an informal manner to discuss the students' performance in class, to solicit information about student problems, to discuss aspects (vocabulary, signs) of a particular area, and to discover the expectation levels. Interpreters generally contacted the teachers to inform them about particular student problems and progress and to discuss general aspects of deafness. Improvements suggested by the teachers centered on: 1) having interpreters function also as tutors and having the interpreter stay within a few selected areas; 2) having a formal meeting schedule to discuss student problems; and 3) having the teacher be more aware of the interpreter's function and seeking out the interpreter more often.

Six reported that counselors and teachers generally met on a daily basis, although two teachers indicated they met upon request, and one gave no response. Only the TVI staff held formal meetings on a regular schedule. Discussions during these meetings concerned individual students. Informal meetings between the teachers and the counselors had the purpose of discussing student needs and problems--personal problems, medical needs, progress in class, clarification of student objectives, attendance problems, career choices, social problems, family problems, and placement decisions. The teachers were generally satisfied with their interaction with the counselors. Those who did suggest improvements in the relationship cited the need for regularly

scheduled meetings to discuss the students and make recommendations, the need for more counselors, and a desire to know more rapidly about job placement.

The teachers indicated they conferred with their immediate supervisors generally on a daily basis, although three said conferences were on a weekly basis and one indicated a bi-weekly format. When asked how frequently they conferred with other administrators during a school quarter, three teachers gave no response, two indicated a weekly format, two said they met bi-weekly, one said they met upon request, and one indicated they met rarely. Most meetings were informal. Discussions between the preparatory teacher and the immediate supervisor concerned student problems (progress, attitude, attendance, personal problems), and program problems (scheduling, curriculum, policies, supplies, and money). Administrators the teachers conferred with other than the immediate supervisor were the program directors, and, in TVI's case, the coordinator of teacher training and the assistant principal. Discussions with these administrators concerned financing, curriculum, student services, general direction and purpose of the program, and academic and behavior problems. Six of the nine teachers thought that administrator/teacher interaction was fine as it was, two gave no response, and one suggested a monthly schedule to discuss problems and to have a more structured setting for in-service meetings. Eight teachers felt the preparatory program was beneficial to the deaf student, and one gave no response. Respondents indicated generally that the entering student is not ready for vocational education and that the preparatory program gives him a chance to assess his objectives and his future. Other benefits cited included provision of a period of maturation, gives a realistic view of the work situation, provides an adequate background for student to enter major field, gives teachers a chance to know the student, the student is allowed to function in independent situations, and the student gets a chance at job sampling.

The preparatory teachers were also asked if the deaf students felt the preparatory program was beneficial to them. Five teachers said the students thought the program was beneficial, one said they

thought it was not beneficial, one gave no response, and two said the students had mixed reactions. The teachers indicated that generally the students realized the benefit of the preparatory classes when they entered into their major area of study. The one teacher indicated the students felt the program was boring and a waste of time, did not meet their needs and expectations, and many times they did not get credit toward their educational objectives.

The preparatory teachers were asked to state the goals of the preparatory program. Goals cited included the following general aspects: 1) to prepare the student for college work (remedial work on language, math, reading; job sampling to allow student to make a realistic choice of area, etc.)., 2) to help the student define his goals and test them; to develop independence for living; to provide adjustment to a hearing school situation and to society in general. 3) to place the student in a job and provide him with the skills necessary to get that job. When asked how these goals were achieved, the teachers focused on the following aspects: a) through job sampling and work exposure; b) the offering of courses in math, reading, and language to build a strong basic foundation; c) the building of maturation through role playing, group discussion, contact with other deaf students, seminars, letting the student experiment, extra-curricular activities, and exposure to the larger hearing society.

Suggested improvements in the preparatory programs included the following suggestions (see Appendix H, Table 28 for final list of suggestions). At Delgado--restructuring of the program, at which point recommendations could be made, and the need for a low-level training program for the deaf to assist those incapable of entering the curriculum. At Seattle--a) need for two more preparatory teachers and teacher aides if the program expands, b) more math materials related to particular subject area; improvement of job sampling, c) better organization and definition of the curriculum. At St. Paul TVI--provide the student with more vocational exploration and, if the money were available, the addition of an evaluation center that would provide the student with "hands-on" experience for short term projects and allow super-

vision and evaluation by an individual from the deaf program.

Additional Comments. Additional comments made by the preparatory teachers may be found in Appendix H, Table 29.

Counselors

General Information. Eight program counselors were interviewed, seven of whom were hearing and one deaf. There were six male and two female counselors. The Delgado and Seattle programs employed three counselors each, and the St. Paul TVI program employed two.

Education. Five of eight counselors had masters degrees and a sixth was in process and six of the eight reported one year or more of counselor training (Table 9). Interpreting and communication skills were acquired mostly on the job.

Employment. All counselors had had some experience, either in counseling or some other capacity, with the deaf prior to their current employment (Table 10). Counseling experience ranged from two summers' work up to 20 years' experience. Only two counselors had had no experience, other than counseling, with deaf individuals before their present employment. All but two counselors had counseled with other than deaf clients (Table 10). Counselors at Seattle and TVI became aware of position availability through the efforts of the program administrators, while those at Delgado were contacted by the program administrator, an official at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and by a Vocational Rehabilitation counselor. Requirements for the position varied by program (Table 11).

Referral Procedures. Counselors from the three programs informed the following agencies and personnel of program opportunities for deaf individuals: residential, public high school, and post-secondary schools serving deaf students; rehabilitation, hearing and speech, and welfare agencies; Vocational Rehabilitation personnel and other counselors; international agencies; and judges and courts. The agencies and personnel were generally contacted by personal visits, by phone, letter, and brochure, workshops, and recruiting tours.

Counselors received information about prospective students from parents, Vocational Rehabilitation counselors, residential and day schools, community contacts, psychiatric referrals. Strengths of the

Table 9

Educational Level and Training of Program Counselors

| Program | | Degrees | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Bachelor | Master |
| Delgado | | | |
| Delgado | 1 | Education | Administrative Education |
| | 2 | Sociology | |
| | 3 | Industrial Arts | Administration & Supervision |
| Seattle | 1 | Religion; Counseling (in process) | |
| | 2 | Social Psychology | Counseling (in process) |
| | 3 | Education of Deaf | Guidance and Counseling |
| TVI | 1 | Social Science | Rehabilitation Counseling |
| | 2 | Psychology | Rehabilitation Counseling |

Table 9

Educational Level and Training of Program Counselors

| | Degrees | | Years of counseling training |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Bachelor | Master | |
| 1 | Education | Administrative Education | one year |
| 2 | Sociology | | none |
| 3 | Industrial Arts | Administration & Supervision | no response |
| 1 | Religion; Counseling (in process) | | one year |
| 2 | Social Psychology | Counseling (in process) | two years |
| 3 | Education of Deaf | Guidance and Counseling | more than 5 years |
| 1 | Social Science | Rehabilitation Counseling | two years |
| 2 | Psychology | Rehabilitation Counseling | two years |

Table 10

Counselors' Prior Experience with the Deaf and Hearing

| Program | DEAF | | H |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Counseling | Other | |
| Delgado | | | |
| 1 | None | Had deaf clients as a vocational evaluator | None |
| 2 | None | Lived with deaf people since losing hearing at age of 8 | As a voca |
| 3 | No response | Over a period of ten years I worked with ten to 15 hard of hearing and deaf clients in speech, speechreading and writing | No respon |
| Seattle | | | |
| 1 | Twenty years of community counseling--out of home, doctor's office and attorney's office | Deaf foster child (3 years) | Practicum months Institu |
| 2 | Four years of dormitory counseling for the deaf at Oregon School for the Deaf | Minister's wife and interpreter (23 yrs.) and teacher | Hearing c family worked worked behavio counsel |
| 3 | Three years of work-study in Montana; coordinator and half-time rehabilitation counselor at Montana School for the Deaf and Blind | Teaching at Montana School for the Deaf and Blind | None |
| TVI | | | |
| 1 | Periodically, for two years in a rehabilitation center | None | Five year with em |
| 2 | Two summers of work counseling deaf high school students at a rehabilitation center | None | Three yea wide va rehabil |

Table 10

Counselors' Prior Experience with the Deaf and Hearing

| DEAF | | HEARING |
|---|---|---|
| ing | Other | |
| onse | Had deaf clients as a vocational evaluator<br>Lived with deaf people since losing hearing at age of 8<br>Over a period of ten years I worked with ten to 15 hard of hearing and deaf clients in speech, speechreading and writing | None<br>As a vocational evaluator<br>No response |
| years of community counsel-<br>out of home, doctor's office<br>ttorney's office<br>ars of dormitory counseling<br>he deaf at Oregon School for<br>eaf | Deaf foster child (3 years)<br>Minister's wife and interpreter (23 yrs.) and teacher | Practicum experience for six months at Oregon Correctional Institution<br>Hearing clients in marriage and family counseling in the home; worked with family counseling; worked at orthopedic hospital behavior science division in family counseling |
| ears of work-study in<br>na; coordinator and half-<br>rehabilitation counselor<br>ntana School for the Deaf<br>lind | Teaching at Montana School for the Deaf and Blind | None |
| cally, for two years in a<br>ilitation center<br>mers of work counseling<br>igh school students at a<br>ilitation center | None<br>None | Five years of experience with people with emotional problems<br>Three years of counseling with a wide variety of clients at a rehabilitation center |

present referral procedures employed were considered to be: At Delgado-- good information going out, students must come in via Vocational Rehabilitation whose counselors know which people are suited for the Delgado program, and personal contacts. At Seattle-- people know about the program through personal contacts, workshops, and seminars; program contacts areas that prospective students would be coming from; an open door policy in accepting students, a willingness to work with students with problems that might prohibit entrance into other schools, and a developed rapport with referral people. At TVI-- knowledge of people in different programs on a personal basis; procedure is built around key people and agencies that have knowledge of the program.

Table 11

Stated Requirements for Acquisition of Counselor Position

Delgado:

1. Willing to transfer to Delgado; willing to work as liason officer; willing to do evaluation work; Master's degree.
2. Experience in being able to work with deaf individuals.
3. No stated requirements.

Seattle:

1. Working on a Bachelor of Arts degree; past work experience mostly.
2. Willingness to put in a lot of time counseling; commitment to go back to school; willingness to make commitment to students; proficiency in manual communication; counseling skills.
3. Communication skills; experience with the deaf; Bachelor of Arts or Science degree; interest in vocational education.

TVI:

1. Experience in counseling and counseling with deaf people; communication skills; certification in St. Paul education system (included having a Master's degree).
2. To get certified by St. Paul school system; work with students in finding jobs and making occupational decisions and the promise to learn how to effectively communicate manually.

Weaknesses of the referral procedures presently employed noted by the counselors were: Delgado--"hit and miss," but no trouble in spreading the word; students should not have to meet the requirements of Vocational Rehabilitation--it is a contradiction to post-secondary opportunities because others do not have to come through Vocational Rehabilitation, which should be thought of as a consumer source for service and money. Seattle--people may look at the Seattle program as a "dumping ground" because of open-door policy; and shortage of staff and funding prevents information from getting out. At TVI--systematic collection of data on students is difficult and time-consuming; need for a better written description of the program. A list of weaknesses described by the counselors is presented in Appendix I, Table 30.

Suggestions for improvement of referral processes included: Delgado--staff members making contacts within the community, opening admissions to private schools for the deaf and day school programs, and enough funds to send people out to contact other schools. Seattle--none in the referral procedure, but some in recruitment and placement procedure. TVI--requiring or effecting the cooperation of the referring school and rehabilitation agency.

Student Placement within the Program. Counselors reported that test scores were used to place students in subject areas. Test measures employed by each school are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Test Measures Utilized to Place Students

| Program | Tests Used |
|---|---|
| Delgado | Standard Achievement Test |
| Seattle | General Aptitude Test Battery<br>Stanford Achievement Test<br>Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale<br>VEPI<br>Strong Vocational Interest Blank |
| TVI | General Aptitude Test Battery<br>Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale<br>Minnesota Paper Form Board<br>Data Processing Aptitude Test<br>GATES Reading Readiness Test<br>Standard Achievement Test |

Criteria other than test scores also varied by program and are listed below:

Delgado:
1. Based on student interest, vocational survey class, adjustment counseling (solidifying objectives by meeting with counselors), preparatory math and English results.
2. Based on personal interview as to what a student will do and take during preparatory program and during training, vocational survey course. Opinion of staff at original staffing has a large bearing on where the student will go into training.
3. A team approach. All members of the team interview the student individually, then sit down, talk about impressions and make a decision from that.

Seattle:
1. Student interest and past experience and experience at program in job sampling.
2. Student interest, student's assessment of own abilities, teacher's assessment based on job sampling, and giving the student information from which they can make their own decision.

TVI:
1. Student interest and teacher evaluation
2. Performance in program, performance in previous employment and vocational training, vocational evaluations done at rehabilitation centers.

Strengths of the present placement procedures were considered to be the following:

Delgado:
1. Detailed information incorporated from preparatory program results.
2. Theoretically, it's wonderful--students get placed according to interest, vocational survey class, and adjusting counseling.
3. Team approach--if one staff member feels very strongly about a student, the student is placed in the program.

Seattle:
1. Student gets into an area where he wants to be and motivation is higher; there is a higher success ratio if the student is interested.
2. Large amount of contact between student and professional staff; the student learns more about himself and his capabilities.
3. Student involvement in evaluation of own skills and potential plus job sampling.

TVI:
1. Knowledge of the different programs within the school and close relationship with the staff within the school.
2. Very pragmatic approach regarding job placement considerations in terms of staff recommendations and student's knowledge of the area.

Table 13

Suggested Changes in Placement Procedures

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Delgado: | 1. | None |
| | 2. | Fine the way it is. Current set-up operating only two semesters. |
| | 3. | Basic theory is good--many types of information (academic, counseling, etc.). Change priority list to student first, letting them be more responsible for shaping the "plastic mold." There is no communication between staff, and students play one against the other. Use all objective data to aid placement, e.g., all testing plus grouping of data so that a comparison (objective) can be made between students already in training and prep students going into training. This would be hypothesized to improve the student's self-understanding of his potentials and have a comparison of what it takes to get through a specific course of study. In many instances, student recommendations by staff have not been followed, and students do fail. The final decision of student training can be made by the parents, students and Vocational Rehabilitation counselor. I'm not sure what this does to the recommendations of the staff in relation to prep classes and curriculum placement on the part of the student. |
| Seattle: | 1. | Try to get information out to the schools and lengthen the amount of time to work with students (I see a lot of student distress during the time in which he's faced with making a decision. |
| | 2. | Strengthen the exposure the student has to actual job situation (you can try to do a career education package in 12 weeks which should be done in high school--impossible task). |
| | 3. | Not well enough defined in my mind now to answer the question. |
| TVI: | 1. | None |
| | 2. | Heavy emphasis on hands-on exploration activities. |

Weaknesses in the placement procedures were thought to be: At Delgado--individual professional judgments of the people involved and administrators making the final decisions on student placement. At Seattle--too few options for students in terms of course offerings and lack of time to work with student. At TVI--lack of "hands-on" (try out or course sampling) information on students and all courses not being offered at the beginning of every quarter. Changes suggested in the present placement procedures are presented in Table 13.

Communication and Interaction with the Students. The counselors reported the use of speech, speechreading, fingerspelling, sign language, and writing in communication. Other less-used modes included gestures, interpreters, drawing pictures, "acting it out," and whatever method the student desired. The counselors reported they communicated adequately with between 80 and 100% of the students, and that they understood all or most of the deaf students' communication. Methods used to understand a student's communication that was not entirely clear included written notes, repetition, asking questions, interpreter aid, slowing down, bringing in another deaf person, simple gestures, and pantomime. The counselors considered their strengths in communicating with the deaf generally to be empathy, interest in the individual and acceptance of the person for what he is, and skill in manual communication, including body and facial expression. Weaknesses generally were thought to be lack of skill and speed in manual communication, difficulty in understanding American Sign Language (Ameslan) and low verbal deaf individuals, and a tendency to view the deaf individual from a counseling standpoint rather than from a human standpoint.

Deaf students' strengths in communication were thought to lie in their flexibility and patience, while their weaknesses were:

1. Differing by person in communication skills.
2. Anxiety levels, frustration, and excitement that makes them communicate at a very rapid pace.
3. Age differences--level of language used might not be clear to them; I'm a staff member.
4. Inability to articulate (also my weakness in not being able to perceive what the student is attempting to articulate).
5. Some clients may be a little bit closed with hearing people.

6. Lack of information about themselves.
7. Inability to understand metaphors and common comparisons used in the English language.
8. The understanding of appropriate social values, e.g., don't turn up the stereo to get vibration because it bothers hearing people.

Time devoted to counseling students varied according to the individual, his function within a program, and the program itself. Estimated percentages of time devoted to counseling ranged from 21% to 100% and case loads varied from 21 to 50 students per quarter. Average time spent with each student ranged from eight times a quarter up to daily conferences, depending on the student. The counselors in the Delgado program said they sometimes had to persuade the deaf student to use the counseling services because the deaf student did not understand the concept of counseling and did not see it as a separate function of the program. A counselor at the TVI program said students sometimes had to be persuaded to meet with a counselor because the student's past experience with counseling may have been on a disciplinary basis. The other TVI counselor said that students from residential institutions tend to have a basic mistrust of hearing persons and see the counselor as a "cop who might kick him out of school."

Classroom problems frequently brought to the counselors included 1) interpreter difficulties (no interpreter in class, relating and communicating with the interpreter, 2) difficulty with classwork (comprehension, ability to keep up in class, needing help with a particular class), 3) complaints that the teachers do not understand the deaf student and are unfair, and interpersonal problems with students and faculty.

Family problems most frequently brought to the counselors by the students were: 1) lack of communication with parents, 2) breakdown in communication in terms of money, planning, etc, 3) conflict between parent expectations and student interests and goals.

Employment problems of deaf students most frequently brought to the counselor's attention included: 1) lack of understanding on the part of hearing employees and poor relationship between employee

and supervisor, 2) dissatisfaction and boredom with job, 3) general employment difficulties--absenteeism, tardiness, employee not doing work, etc.

Other problems frequently brought to the counselors by deaf students were: 1) personal--inability to deal with depression, confusion regarding life goals and future plans, types of jobs to look for, roommate difficulties, peer group problems, etc. 2) information problems--where to obtain medical assistance, financial questions, transportation questions, housing difficulties.

The counselors were asked to state what they considered to be the strengths of the present counseling procedure. They were:

Delgado:
1. Much freedom for individual counselor to operate as he wishes.
2. See students and gather information in adjustment, community and education
3. No response

Seattle:
1. Student-oriented. Lot of acceptance of students as they are. Looking at students and their potentials, accountability of people who work with the students
2. Open door policy--the student is welcome anytime. All counselors sign and there is a small counselor-student ratio which allows individual attention
3. Real dedication to the students. The student is the top priority. The total concept of the program revolves around counselor-student relationships. Small case load.

TVI:
1. Availability of quality counselor services
2. Flexible enough to make counseling department available to students and small enough to allow counselors to spend time with students and deal with them on a personal basis.

The following were considered weaknesses:

Delgado:
1. Old authoritarian philosophy of counseling. The counselor runs around snooping into a person's life. It is not a creative service.
2. Lack of counseling staff meetings.
3. No response

Seattle:
1. The congenitally deaf low-verbal person's needs are not being met adequately--relating problems.

2. There is a need for upgrading in communication skills. More office hours are needed, and there is a need for better communication of information to students.
3. Not enough structure--a little too loosely oriented. No deaf counselor on the staff. The case load is too large. We need more time to look into new programs. Maybe a little more structure to provide the right kind of follow-up.

TVI:
1. It would be good to have a female counselor on the staff and a counselor available at nights and on the weekends on a full-time basis, a residence-type counselor.
2. The counselors have a conflict of roles; they have administrative duties (roles) to play.

Changes in the present counseling procedures the counselors suggested were:

Delgado:
1. Staff meetings once a week.
2. More freedom of association with students and more counseling away from program buildings. Don't ask the counselors to report on why a student was late to class--you are not dealing with children. Counseling should be coordinated with all phases of the program.
3. No response

Seattle:
1. Define some goals more clearly. Place someone in charge of placement. Community involvement. Better counselor role definition. More communication and formal staffing with program administrator.
2. More emphasis on group counseling. I would like to see a removal of the quasi-disciplinary role and more autonomy from the rest of the program.
3. Good interaction now.

TVI:
1. None
2. Counselors need their roles better defined to the rest of the staff.

Interaction with Parents. Counselors had little interaction with parents (estimates of time spent in conferences with parents ranged from 0 to 10% a quarter). Most counselor/parent conferences were conducted by phone, by letter, or in person. Reasons for desiring meetings generally included a desire for knowledge about the student's personal, financial and academic situation and a desire for information about the program. Counselors generally regarded present interaction with

the parents as satisfactory since they considered their responsibility to be to the student and not to the parent.

Interaction with Preparatory Program Teachers. All counselors met frequently with the preparatory program teachers on an informal basis. Meetings were initiated generally to discuss: 1) Student progress in the classroom and in the program. 2) The student's vocational direction. 3) Programming and curriculum. 4) Student personal problems that are interfering with progress. The counselors at Delgado and Seattle felt that the present interaction was satisfactory and suggested no improvements, although one Delgado counselor thought that scheduled weekly meetings might be held to discuss student progress. The TVI counselors suggested the following improvements: 1) A better definition of responsibilities relating to discipline (attendance); the problem is that the counselor is sometimes perceived as a cop. Attendance is a teacher's responsibility, but a counselor should help, specifically if the problem is serious, 2) More contact with them.

Interaction with Technical/Vocational Teachers. The counselors generally communicated frequently with the technical/vocational teachers in an informal manner during the course of a quarter. Estimates of time spent during a quarter in communication with the technical/vocational and the preparatory program teachers ranged from 5 to 30%. The counselors and the teachers met to discuss: 1) Student difficulties in the classroom (progress, attendance, need for an interpreter). 2) Need for tutorial help. 3) Job leads for the student. Most counselors were satisfied with the present relationship and suggested no improvements. One Delgado counselor suggested "some kind of feedback from the deaf program to the instructor who has deaf students in his class." And one TVI counselor thought there should be more of an understanding of individual areas on the part of the counselor, more feedback on the success of the student, and that there should be more contact regarding discipline problems and how teachers should handle them.

Interaction with Interpreters. Estimates of time spent in communication with the interpreters during the quarter ranged from

0 to 15%. Most meetings were on an informal basis. Contact generally concerned: 1) Student progress in the classroom (comprehension, attendance, etc.). 2) Interpreting arrangements and assignments. 3) Information on subject material. 4) Student personal problems interfering with course work. Suggested improvements in the counselor/interpreter relationship included:

Delgado:
1. Interpreters should not try to be counselors. Problems should be handled in class if appropriate; otherwise, let the counselor handle it.
2. Remove the title "interpreter/counselor aide." Interpreters should not deal with the adjustment or social aspect of the students. They have never been organized by a professional who would control and teach them what they can and can't do. It is a question of dependence development between student and interpreter. And interpreters should be paid as tutors.

Seattle:
1. To continue to work at making it a more open relationship and a better understanding on the interpreter's part about what a counselor does and that a student's behavior cannot be changed in one or two counseling sessions.
2. Closer contact between the two. The interpreter will mention a problem and if it is not cleared up immediately, the interpreter feels that the counselor is not doing a good job. A better awareness of each person's role.
3. None

TVI:
1. None
2. A few more systematic meetings with interpreters to discuss what they are doing.

Interaction with Administrators. Counselor estimate of time spent in communication with administrators during a quarter ranged from two to 20%. Administrative duties required of the counselors consumed from 0 to 50% of their time, depending on the program and the counselor's function within that program. Descriptions of administrative duties included:

Delgado:
1. None
2. None
3. No response

Seattle:
1. Progress reports, communication with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation counselors.
2. Supervision of counseling component of program, organization of scheduling for preparatory program, scheduling for job sampling, arranging for staffing, registration information dissemination.
3. None

TVI:
1. Financial aid counselor for TVI (both deaf and hearing), admissions counselor for all printers, administrator for male housing.
2. In charge of admissions, public relations work, answer most of general inquiries about the program both by letter and in person, scheduling and programming and coordinating with regular training areas, locker assignments, and book store questions.

Discussions between the counselors and the administrators generally concerned: 1) Student progress and problems. 2) Program needs (scheduling, interpreter needs, financial aid, etc.). 3) Upgrading of preparatory program and counseling services. 4) Overall program development and policy decisions. A complete list of suggested improvements in counselor/administrator relationship is available in Appendix I, Table 31. Briefly, TVI counselors thought the relationship fine, Seattle counselors thought that more communication and trust was needed, and Delgado counselors felt that the administration was abrogating the function of the counselors.

Student Job Placement. Counselors generally both contacted and were contacted by prospective employers, although the procedure varied from program to program. Appendix I, Table 32 provides the counselors' complete descriptions of placement procedures. The counselors generally seek employment in the student's chosen area, and the student may attend an interview by himself, with an interpreter, or, in some cases, with the counselor. The counselors from the Seattle and TVI program said they sometimes visited the student on the job; the counselors from Delgado said they did not. Problems discussed during such visits were:

1. Communication difficulties (employer may want to get information across more quickly).
2. Employee satisfaction and progress on the job.
3. General employment difficulties--attendance, carelessness on the job, misunderstanding between co-workers.

Complaints most heard from employers were:

1. Poor performance on the job and attendance problems (not with much frequency).
2. Not enough training in a specific area.
3. Not sure employee is understanding work and instruction.
4. Rigidity in ability of deaf to adapt to new situations.

Complaints most heard from the deaf employees were:

1. Promotion is not fast enough.
2. Job is too routine.
3. Training was not adequate.
4. Lack of understanding on the part of the supervisor in terms of communication and opportunities for advancement.

Employers considered their deaf employees to have good attitudes, to be good workers, to be dependable, reliable, and to have good work habits. The counselors reported sporadic contact with a student once he has a job. Only three counselors thought that employer/deaf employee relationships would be improved by increased contact with a counselor or some other consultant in deafness. Generally, the counselors felt the student should be prepared to function independently on the job, but that relationships might be improved if communication channels were opened between the employer and the counselor. Appendix I, Table 33 provides a complete list of suggested improvements.

Withdrawals. The counselors listed the following general reasons for student withdrawal from the program:

1. Academic difficulties.
2. Social and personal adjustment problems (drugs, peer group interaction, emotional difficulties, pregnancy).
3. Low relationship between training area and future objectives.
4. Financial difficulties.
5. Program may be inappropriate for student.

Generally speaking, most counselors had only sporadic contact with a student once he had withdrawn from the program. Counselors

Table 14

Counselors' Descriptions of Program Follow-up Procedures

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Delgado: | 1. | Sporadic contact by visits of students. Social contact. Questionnaires sent out to students who have left (to about 90%). |
| | 2. | The program writes letters to former students requesting information about present activities. |
| | 3. | This area is the major responsibility of the research center. |
| Seattle: | 1. | It is handled on an individual basis. It is not a structured approach at this time. Employer contact, possibly. |
| | 2. | Through on-the-job contact and sporadic social meetings with the students. |
| | 3. | We ask the student to send a letter telling what he is doing--if he has a job, where he is, etc. We also ask the DVR counselors where the student is. |
| TVI: | 1. | We almost always contact the employer once within the first month's employment of a student if he was placed by the program. We have follow-up information on almost every student generally by word of mouth. |
| | 2. | We have sporadic contact with employers in the general community and continual contact with employers who want to hire deaf people. |

Table 15

Suggested Improvements in the Follow-Up Procedures

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Delgado: | 1. | None |
| | 2. | None, because it is out of my jurisdiction. |
| | 3. | The program should develop a systematic, planned approach allowing for counseling services or a paid researcher. The program should keep a closer relationship with Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and develop a better relationship with students while they are here so that they want to keep in touch. |
| Seattle: | 1. | We need a more structured schedule and more regular checking-back on the student. We don't do it now because of the lack of time. |
| | 2. | Establish a follow-up procedure to find answers to questions asked in this form. |
| | 3. | None |
| TVI: | 1. | We should have a more systematic follow-up, make sure that students are working at optimal level and help students make job changes at times of promotion and to help them to know how to make another job contact. |
| | 2. | It would be good if more specific information were collected on salary, promotion, possibilities for promotion, and the relationship of job success for the deaf and hearing in the same major. This could be tied in with a continuous education program. |

referred withdrawals to agencies or rehabilitation counselors. Referrals went most often to:

1. Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
2. Welfare agencies
3. Manpower services
4. Speech and hearing centers
5. New programs and schools
6. Employers

Follow-up Procedures. Each program handled its follow-up procedure in a different manner. Each was characterized by an informal, unstructured approach consisting of letters and questionnaires sent to former students, social contacts, visits by former students, employer contact, and on-the-job contact (See Table 14). Suggested improvements in the procedures tended to emphasize the need for a more structured approach to follow-up procedures (See Table 15).

School Relations. The program counselors reported they conferred with school counselors about: 1. Student problems (difficulties between a deaf and a hearing student; placement of deaf student into a specific training area). 2. Administrative procedures (admissions and matriculation, financial aid). 3. To seek information on their programs for structuring a program for the deaf students. 4. To utilize their expertise in counseling.

The counselors also conferred with a variety of other school staff, depending on the program and the counselor's duties, including technical teachers, deans, union people, registration, financial aid people, etc. Conferences were held generally to discuss such topics as registration procedures, financial aid, work-study areas, post-secondary opportunities for the deaf, the program for the deaf itself, etc.

Additional Comments. Additional comments made by counselors may be found in Appendix I, Table 34.

Regular Classroom Teachers

General Information. All of the 77 technical/vocational teachers interviewed were hearing. Appendix J, Table 35 provides a complete list of subjects taught by the teachers. Only two teachers, both at

Delgado, had had prior experience in teaching the deaf. Thirty teachers had experience with the deaf other than teaching. Among such contacts listed were: worked with deaf people, social relationships, and deaf relatives and neighbors.

Communication and Interaction. The most common mode of interaction (Table 16) was through interpreters (57) followed by writing (53), gestures (46), and speech and speechreading (42). A substantial number of the TVI teachers reported using signs (14) and fingerspelling (15).

Table 16

Technical-Vocational Teachers' Mode of Communication with Deaf Students in the Classroom

| | Delgado | Seattle | TVI | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Speech and speechreading | 13 | 13 | 16 | 42 |
| Fingerspelling | 4 | 10 | 15 | 29 |
| Sign language | 6 | 8 | 14 | 28 |
| Writing | 21 | 12 | 20 | 53 |
| Gestures | 16 | 8 | 22 | 46 |
| Interpreter aid | 22 | 13 | 22 | 57 |
| Other | 1 | 1 | 22 | 24 |
| No response | 2 | 7 | 0 | 9 |

Thirty-two of the 77 teachers said they understood some of the deaf students' communication. Thirty said they understood most of it; nine said they understood all of it; and six said they understood none of it.

Thirty of the 77 teachers indicated they understood some of the deaf students' speech. Twenty-three understood most of the speech; 12 understood none; 10 understood all; and two gave no response.

The teachers were asked what means they employed to understand a student's communication they did not understand. Most frequent responses were writing (47) and use of interpreter (33).

Fifty-seven teachers said that the hearing students in their classes interacted with the deaf students; 20 said they did not. They indicated the most prevalent modes of communication between the hearing and deaf students were: gestures (42), writing (41), sign language

(32), fingerspelling and interpreter (30 each), and speech and speech-reading (28). Fourteen teachers felt there was always communication between hearing and deaf students; 17 thought there was communication most of the time; 7 said there was communication sometimes; 4 said there was occasionally communication; 18 said there was seldom communication; 15 gave no response: one said there was never any communication between deaf and hearing students; and one did not know.

Twenty-seven teachers reported they slowed their teaching for the benefit of the deaf, and 48 said they did not. Two indicated they sometimes did. Only four teachers felt that slowing down the teaching pace affected the hearing students adversely. The reactions generally were manifested in restlessness and impatience. Some teachers felt the hearing students could use the slowing down process also. Appendix I, Table 36 provides a list of teachers' descriptions of hearing students' reactions.

The technical/vocational teachers made class notes and outlines available in the same manner as with hearing students. Seventy-two of the teachers said they made themselves available to the deaf students for subject review or extra work.

When asked what the strengths of teaching an integrated class were, teachers gave a variety of responses. Most touched upon the opportunity it provided deaf students to maintain contact with the "real" (i.e. hearing) world. Factors the teachers mentioned included: builds confidence in ability to function with hearing people; deaf students get the same kind of education as the hearing; provides the deaf with a real life situation; provides practice in learning to cope with hearing people; deaf can evaluate their own performance [illegible] hearing students' performance; builds self-esteem; and, generally, that both hearing and deaf students gained maturity from the experience. Appendix J, Table 37 provides a complete list of responses.

The weaknesses of teaching an integrated class were considered by the teachers to involve problems of communication. The interpreter was considered a key link in the communication process. That position was mentioned quite often in the responses. The teachers pointed out the difficulties of not communicating directly and of having a weak

interpreter; that is, one who may not know the subject matter or terminology well. Other factors mentioned were language and vocabulary background weaknesses on the part of the deaf student, slowing of the pace in the classroom; and necessity to spend more time with deaf students. Appendix J, Table 38 provides a complete list of factors teachers consider weaknesses in teaching an integrated class.

The use of interpreters or matters relating to them, are mentioned 21 times in response to suggestions for improvements (Appendix J, Table 39). Suggested improvements included: more interpreters, improved interpretation, having interpreters use exact English, interpreters present all the time, making sure the interpreter has a knowledge of the subject area, retaining the same interpreter and not changing them often, and having a low ratio of students to interpreters. Other suggestions were: more interaction among teachers, hearing students, and deaf students; more visual aids; awareness on the part of the teacher of the problems and communication skills of the deaf; and knowledge of sign language by the teacher.

Forty-eight of the technical/vocational teachers felt that the deaf students did not understand adequately; nine gave no response; and five said it depended on the individual. Reasons why the teachers felt the deaf students did not adequately understand the subject matter (Appendix J, Table 40) included: the background of the deaf students--limited vocabulary, low basic skills, poor reading skills and comprehension, lack of basic language; teacher may not be getting message to interpreter; interpreter may not be interpreting correctly; interpreter is not getting through because it is second-hand information; and interpreter may lack knowledge of the subject area.

Teacher Interaction with Other Staff. All 77 technical/vocational teachers considered interpreter aid valuable, especially in facilitation of the communication process--nearly 40 of the responses mention communication specifically. Teachers believed interpreter aid saves time, provides teachers with communication channels and deaf student with the same, and provides the deaf students adequate means of comprehending the subject matter. Reasons why teachers considered interpreter aid valuable are presented in full in Appendix J, Table 41.

Teacher/interpreter interaction is high with both teachers and interpreters seeking each other out to discuss such student problems as attendance, low grades, low comprehension of subject matter, personal problems, and general class problems. Appendix J, Tables 42 and 43 present complete lists of reasons for interaction between interpreters and teachers.

When asked what improvements in teacher/interpreter communication and cooperation they would suggest, the technical/vocational teachers cited the need for the interpreters to be familiar with the subject matter they are interpreting. Other improvements (Appendix J, Table 44) suggested included: keeping the same interpreter from previous sessions, more interpreters, scheduled meetings to discuss students, and more opportunities for teachers to learn sign language.

Technical/vocational teachers and counselors, on the whole, meet only two or three times a quarter. Reasons for contacting one another (Appendix J, Tables 45 and 46) included: student attendance, motivation, classwork problems (test failures, grades, not understanding material), student goals, personal problems, personal hygiene, discipline problems, job placement, and procedural matters to be worked out. Most contacts involved student progress in personal, social and academic areas.

When asked what improvements in teacher/counselor interaction they would suggest, the technical/vocational teachers indicated there should be more contact so that the teacher would know which counselor was responsible for the particular student and so that the counselor could provide the teacher with background information on the student. Some teachers indicated that such interaction could provide more follow-up on the students' progress and achievement and that the counselors could help the teachers to deal with the deaf students in their classrooms. Others said that as long as the counselor was available that would be sufficient. Appendix J, Table 47 presents a complete list of suggested improvements.

Overall, contact between the technical/vocational teachers and the program administrators is limited. Discussions generally concern student difficulties and performance in class, scheduling problems,

general information about the deaf, placement opportunities, and exploration of new ideas concerning deaf students. (Appendix J, Tables 48 and 49).

Many teachers felt that contact with the program administrator was not necessary and that problems could be handled more easily through the counselors and interpreters.

Suggested improvement in teacher/administrator interaction by others included: meetings to acquaint teachers with the deaf program, its staff and its goals; better handlings of forms and reports; more information about services available in order to take advantage of them; and feedback to teacher concerning placement of students. Appendix J, Table 50 lists the improvements suggested by the teachers.

Additional information. Additional information, and suggestions, provided by the teachers may be found in Table 51, Appendix J.

Interpreters

General Information. Thirty-one interpreters were interviewed, eight from the Delgado program, 14 from Seattle, and nine from St. Paul TVI.

Education. Most interpreters had some post secondary education and seven held college degrees or certificates. Formal interpreter training ranged from none up to nine months. Sixteen of the 31 interpreters had deaf family members (six at Delgado, eleven at Seattle, and one at TVI). Formal programs were attended at colleges, a speech and hearing center, and the TVI Interpreter Institute, a summer course designed to train interpreters for the TVI program.

Employment. Interpreters at the Delgado and Seattle programs had had a variety of interpreting experiences including courtroom interpreting, classroom interpreting, counseling experience, social work and welfare experience, religious classes, and interpreting for organizations for the deaf. Most of the TVI interpreters had been trained by the TVI Institute and had no previous interpreting experience. Interpreters became aware of the availability of employment through a variety of means such as through other interpreters, friends, counselors, parents, announcements, talks, and the interpreter institute. Stated requirements varied from program to program

but the most heavily emphasized requirement was knowledge and skill in sign language.

Communication and Interaction with Students. Interpreters used speechreading, sign language and fingerspelling most commonly with deaf students. Writing and gestures were less commonly employed. Most interpreters felt they understand between 80 and 100% of the deaf students' communication, and they generally thought they understood most or all of the deaf students' speech. For those students whose communication they did not fully understand, most interpreters employed repetition to aid comprehension.

Most felt that deaf and hearing students interacted with one another. The deaf and hearing students communicated with one another through a variety of means, most commonly interpreter aid, writing, gestures, speech and speechreading, and fingerspelling.

All interpreters reported that teachers and deaf students in their classes communicated with one another, with interpreter aid and writing being the most common modes of communication. Most interpreters at the Delgado program felt that the teachers and deaf students communicated seldom. Those at Seattle and TVI thought the teachers and deaf students communicated most of the time.

Interpreting Skills. Sixteen of the interpreters considered themselves knowledgeable in the subject areas they interpreted; eight said they were knowledgeable in some areas, five said they were not, and two gave no response. See Appendix K, Table 52 for the subjects interpreted at each school. When asked how they dealt with frequently used words for which there was no corresponding sign, most interpreters said they would invent a new sign, fingerspell it for the student's benefit, and have the students' agreement on the use of the new sign. When dealing with infrequently used words, most interpreters would fingerspell that particular word. Interpreters were asked to describe the program policies concerning development and incorporation of new sign language vocabulary. The Delgado and Seattle programs had informal policies in which interpreters agreed among themselves and with students upon the use of new signs. The St. Paul TVI program has a formal policy under which the interpreter keeps a

booklet of new signs for each subject area. At the end of the year, the signs are discussed, adopted or discarded, and then computerized. Informally, discussion among the interpreters also aided the coordination of sign language usage with program policy.

Interpreters were asked on what basis they were chosen to interpret their particular subjects, and a variety of answers was given. Most at Delgado were chosen on the basis of past interpreting experience in the subject and interest in that subject. Those at Seattle were chosen on the basis of ability and fluency, and past experience with knowledge of that subject. TVI interpreters indicated no particular basis, although the newer interpreters were given the "easier" classes to interpret.

Interpreters were asked if they translated word-for-word what was being said in the classroom or if they interpreted it. Most interpreters indicated they did both or that it varied according to the student.

Interpreters at the three programs indicated that note taking services were available to the students. The services were on a voluntary basis, usually on the part of hearing students. The interaction between notetaker and interpreter consisted mostly of the interpreter checking the accuracy of the notes taken.

Twenty-one felt the deaf students understood subject matter adequately, nine thought it depended on the student, and six felt they did not. Ten TVI interpreters thought the students did understand in a shop situation and did not understand material in a classroom situation. Those who felt the students did not have adequate comprehension gave a variety of answers including lack of background and skills, difficult subject matter, poor language skills, and poor teacher explanation.

Interpreter/Technical-Vocational Teacher Interaction. Interpreters at the three programs communicated relatively frequently during a quarter with the technical/vocational teachers, depending on the interpreter and the student. Nearly all teachers made their class notes and outlines available to the interpreter, usually at the beginning of the quarter or as the quarter progressed. Most interpreters indi-

cated they did not work with the teachers in incorporating and developing new sign language vocabulary for each subject area. No formal schedule for meeting teachers existed at the three programs, but most interpreters said they met informally with the teachers. Meetings generally concerned student difficulty with subject matter, student questions, clarification of subject matter and assignments, job interviews and placement, absences and lateness, and a general exchange of information regarding the student. Suggested improvements in interpreter/teacher communication and cooperation centered mainly on the need to orient the teachers toward the problems of deafness and the students' capacity to comprehend.

Interpreter/Program Counselor Interaction. Interpreters and program counselors communicated between five and 15 times a quarter. Most interpreters had no formal schedule for meeting with the counselors, but all met informally. Reasons for contact generally concerned academic, behavior and attitude problems of the student. Other reasons included job counseling, scheduling, financial needs of the student, and job interviews. Interpreters were generally satisfied with the present interaction with the program counselors. Suggested improvement in the relationship included more communication and meetings between the two to discuss problems and procedures.

Interpreter/Administrator Interaction. Interpreters and administrators communicated infrequently during the school quarter. Only the Seattle program had a formal meeting schedule in which staff meetings were held once a month to discuss program changes and policies and the interpreter training program. Nearly all interpreters met informally with the administrator. Contact generally concerned student problems and progress, procedural changes, administrative duties, interpreting and tutorial services, and general duties. Suggested improvements in the interpreter/administrator relationship came mostly from the Delgado program and centered on the need for more communication, more meetings, and greater availability of the administrator.

Additional Comments. Additional comments made by the interpreters may be found in Appendix K, Table 53.

Administrators

General Information. The three program directors were interviewed. All were hearing males.

Education. The administrators' educational backgrounds are presented in Table 18. None were trained at the Bachelor or Master degree level in education of the deaf. None had degrees in educational administration and/or supervision. Manual communication skills were acquired by the Delgado and Seattle program directors at state schools for the deaf. The program director at TVI acquired his communication skills from his deaf parents. Only the Seattle program director had attended formal manual communication courses--a sequence of three sign language courses with a practicum with high school students and adults.

Table 17

Degrees Held by Program Administrators

| | Bachelor | Master | Doctorate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Delgado | Education | Education | |
| Seattle | Psychology | Audiology & Speech Pathology | Psychology of Deafness |
| TVI | Economics | Speech Pathology & Audiology | |

Previous Employment. The Delgado program director had previous experience as a teacher at a state school for the deaf. The Seattle director was a counselor at the Seattle program for the deaf for two years and assistant director for three months. The TVI administrator acted as a state vocational rehabilitation consultant for the deaf for seven years and was a counselor for a state department of public welfare.

Current Employment. The Delgado director was contacted by the college administration concerning his present position while an evaluator at the Delgado Vocational Rehabilitation Center. The Seattle administrator was told of the availability of the position

the then-current program directors. The IVI program director instrumental in helping to write up the program proposal.

Administrators saw as major duties of their current positions:

Delgado: To administer program, policy decisions, organization, program changes, liason with upper administration, preparing and submitting budgets.

Seattle: In-service training of personnel. Making disciplinary decisions. Coordinating counseling and preparatory program.

IVI: Funding and overall maintenance of program--staff, students, all integrative aspects.

The program directors saw as the basic goals of the deaf programs:

Delgado: To integrate deaf students into student activity on campus. The students should be able to obtain work at the end of training. The integration of the deaf within the hearing school and community.

Seattle: To provide the same access to educational opportunities for the deaf as other people have.

IVI: Skill acquisition which leads to meaningful employment. To serve the social growth and personal maturation of the student.

Expectations for a graduate from the deaf program on the part of the directors were:

Delgado: Employment--being able to produce and to get along with employees.

Seattle: To be able to define his own life objectives and to be able to accomplish those objectives.

IVI: To obtain employment at a level higher than he could have obtained without this experience and a hope for vertical movement within the job, incorporating future training.

Expectations for a nongraduate were:

Delgado: To accept employment. Terminated students should have some abilities, should be able to adjust more adequately and have employment, probably at a lower level.

Seattle: To use other services available to him better than he can use those at Seattle Community College.

IVI: The same as those for a graduate--employment at a level higher than he could have had without this experience.

The administrators were asked what aspects of the program had exceeded their expectations. Their responses were:

Delgado: The counseling approach has changed from formal to informal (need basis). Contact with the community is not as close. There is no infringement on the rights of students.

Seattle: The preparatory program has changed from integrated to self-contained. There is increasing emphasis on counseling services. The establishment of the interpreter/tutor role. With expansion, they have learned to use college resources (i.e., media).

TVI: Basically, the program has not changed. The vocational exploration aspect of the preparatory program is being looked at. Refinements are the only changes. The Interpreter Institute and the media program are the only global changes. Trying to minimize the number of non-graduates.

The program administrators were asked what program changes they would like to see in the future. The desired changes were at:

Delgado: Improved facilities and addition of a media center. Merger with rehabilitation division. The staff could be more exacting and effective in what we're doing.

Seattle: Establishing interpreting as a profession. Upgrading the interpreter-tutor idea. Opportunity for good curriculum development in vocational exposure. A research component at the college level. There is a need for more profiles of activities and needs in different components of the program.

TVI: Expansion of the Interpreter Institute and development of the consortium program. Research components and research activities.

Student Recruitment. Program directors made their programs known to the public through mailings, talks, paper presentations, visits, the presence of interpreters on television news, and through the "deaf grapevine." Information about prospective students was received from Vocational Rehabilitation counselors, schools for the deaf, speech and hearing centers, parents, self-referrals, and school officials. Agencies and personnel informed by the program directors of opportunities were Vocational Rehabilitation counselors, school counselors, deaf organizations, and public and residential schools.

The Delgado administrator thought the strengths of his present referral procedure to be the reception of information from Vocational Rehabilitation and the weaknesses to be that information sometimes

did not come in prior to admissions and staffings. The Seattle program administrator felt the main strength of his referral procedure to be that everyone (student, VR counselor, school) knows what the student is getting. He saw no weaknesses in the procedure. The TVI administrator saw strength in that a system is followed that creates minimum difficulty--seldom did the program have to contact someone for additional information. Weaknesses in the referral procedure were attributed to the lack of organization in the whole system of deaf education which creates a lack of consistent information. No changes were suggested in the present referral procedures, although the TVI administrator thought that schools for the deaf should go on a more standard record keeping system.

Admissions Requirements

The following admissions requirements were listed by the program directors:

Delgado:
1. The student is deaf to the point where he needs supportive services in the classroom.
2. A fifth grade reading and math level, a requirement which is flexible.
3. The student is free of other physical and mental handicaps.

Seattle:
1. A demonstration of one's ability to profit from the program.
2. A fifth grade reading level, a requirement which is flexible.

TVI:
1. A student should have enough of a hearing loss to need at least one service of the program. We don't look at decibel loss alone.
2. The ability to profit by a course of study here.
3. Reasonably socially acceptable behavior.
4. Will not take a student who has plateaued academically in his last three years of school.

The administrators considered the following aspects to be the strengths of the admissions requirements:

Delgado: They are flexible enough to allow for the student who may be a borderline case to enter program.

Seattle: They are flexible enough to meet the needs of individuals.

TVI: They look at students realistically. We have a functional idea of how students have been doing beforehand. We take into consideration the students' strengths. We feel a majority of deaf students can and should be served by a program of technical/vocational nature.

The Delgado program director saw no weaknesses in the admissions requirements. The Seattle administrator saw a need for improvement in the tailoring of programs to the wide range of students admitted. The TVI program director saw weakness in the lack of consistent information available from referring sources.

When asked what changes, if any, they would make in the present admissions requirements, the directors responded:

Delgado: The program will adopt an open-door policy to coincide with college admissions requirements.

Seattle: More tailoring of programs to the wide range of students admitted.

TVI: It is a never ending process of educating referral sources to provide consistent information. Referring agents understand the program as much as they need to make proper referrals.

Student Financial Support. The following financial support was available to the students:

Delgado: Support comes from hometown Vocational Rehabilitation counselor or from parents.

Seattle: Support is available from Vocational Rehabilitation, public assistance, work-study, community jobs (part-time), college scholarships, loans, department scholarships and loans, scholarships from organizations in town.

TVI: Support is available from the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and in the form of loans granted on the decisions of the counselors.

The requirements for awarding financial support were identical at Delgado and TVI—support was awarded by the decisions of state Vocational Rehabilitation counselors. The Seattle program director stated that financial assistance was awarded on the basis of parental ability to support and according to personal need.

Medical Services. Medical services were as follows:

Delgado: An audiological consultant administers tests at the beginning of the program. A speech and hearing center is available upon student request (the student pays for this service). A medical center is available a few blocks from campus. And the school has a first aid center.

Seattle: The program has a policy with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation to support emergency-type situations. An in-town doctor does free medical work (if the student can afford it, he charges a nominal fee). The college has an infirmary.

TVI: The school has a full-time nurse on duty, on an as-needed basis. A united hospitals service is available in the city.

The Delgado and Seattle programs employed an audiologist and screening was conducted at the time of each student's entry into the program. The TVI program did not employ an audiologist. Delgado and Seattle did not employ a speech therapist. The TVI program did, and the therapist's services were available on a weekly as-needed basis.

Preparatory Program. The goals of the preparatory program as cited by the program directors were:

Delgado: To prepare the student academically and vocationally.

Seattle: To allow the student to make an adjustment to his selected training area.

TVI: To provide basic adjustment to TVI. It is an opportunity to adjust to independent living and to learn to use supportive services. It is also an opportunity to select an area of study and to develop secure peer group identification.

The program directors stated that the goals of the preparatory program were achieved in the following manner:

Delgado: Through instructors, remedial instruction in English and math, staffings, vocational sampling programs. The Communication Skills course teaches students new signs.

Seattle: Depending on the student's needs, the program varies.

TVI: A formalized program of study emphasizes receptive and expressive skills, math, personal management, formulas, family management, vocational exploration, and planned counseling.

The courses of study available in the preparatory programs can be found in Table 19. Courses in the Delgado preparatory program were mandatory. The formulas course at TVI was optional for females because of the "basic nature of technical/vocational education." The preparatory program scheduling at the Seattle program was flexible.

Table 18

Course of Study Available in the Preparatory Programs

| | |
|---|---|
| Delgado: | No response; however, the basic courses are remedial instruction in English and math, vocational sampling, and communication skills. |
| Seattle: | Self-evaluation and general overall college exposure. Job sampling and mini-curriculum. An individualized process in getting ready for entry--reading, language, math, and college orientation. |
| TVI: | Receptive and expressive skills, math, personal management. Formulas, family management, vocational exploration. Planned counseling. |

Table 19

Test Measures Utilized for Student Placement

| | |
|---|---|
| Delgado: | The Stanford Achievement Test reading achievement level.<br>The General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB) gives an idea of what vocational area the student should go into.<br>IQ score is used for subject placement. |
| Seattle: | The Stanford Achievement Test is used for profile purposes only.<br>The GATB.<br>Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale<br>A diagnostic test from the preparatory program teachers.<br>Vocational Interest tests.<br>WEPT: non-verbal |
| TVI: | CATB<br>Stanford Achievement Test<br>Past record information<br>GATES<br>TVI diagnostic math test<br>Subjective tests<br>Tests are given for each training area |

According to the program director, the student is normally pre-registered in all preparatory program courses; however, if the student takes a different direction or does not need these courses, he may substitute a college course.

Student Placement Within the Program. The three program directors said they used test scores in placement of students within particular subject areas. The measures used are reported in Table 20. Criteria other than test scores that determined student placement were:

Delgado: The interest of the student as determined by interviews. The evaluation of test scores overrode student interest.

Seattle: Trial performance of the student and the interest of the student.

TVI: Counseling, staffing, expressed interest of the student, and the expressed interest of the family.

The Delgado director thought the strength of his placement procedure lay in the fact that very few students changed their program of study. The Seattle administrator saw strength in that both the faculty member and the student have a "good idea of what they're getting into" and the student has a good idea about training and work area he will end up in. The TVI administrator saw integration of the total staff into the decision-making process as the strength of his placement procedure.

The Delgado program director saw no weaknesses in his placement procedure and had no changes to suggest. The Seattle director saw weakness in the limited amount of time the staff has to prepare a student for the training decision. Changes he desired were "more-upgraded, more in-depth exposure in training in industrial areas, and more appropriate academic material for preparation." The TVI administrator saw no operational weaknesses in his placement procedure--the weakness, he stated, came from student capability. Changes he desired were "daily monitoring--continue to work together as a team so that students can be handled on an individual basis."

Communication and Interaction with Students. The program directors communicated with the students through speech and speechreading, sign language, fingerspelling, writing and gestures. The Delgado and Seattle directors thought they understood most communication from their deaf students, while the TVI administrator felt that he understood

all communication from his students. The Delgado administrator would use the services of an interpreter if the student were low-verbal. The Seattle program director made use of expansion and repetition. The TVI director said "one way or the other I'll understand it all."

The Delgado program director met with students on an informal basis. The Seattle and TVI administrators met with their students on both an informal and formal appointment basis. The Delgado administrator said that reasons for contact with students generally included problems with school functions, personal problems, money needs, Vocational Rehabilitation problems, and the seeking of advice. The Seattle program director had contact with student to "talk about anything," to review student efforts, to set up meetings, and to follow-up telephone conversations from counselors, parents and other individuals. The TVI director met with students to "share good and bad news," to monitor general progress, talk about scheduling, and to set up special events.

The Delgado program director saw strength in the administrator/student relationship in that he did not get involved in their problems. The Seattle administrator felt the strength in the administrator/student relationship lay in the casual acceptance of one another. The TVI program director thought that strength lay in the free and open relationship--no student feared coming in to see him, and the students know that information is confidential. The administrators saw the following weaknesses in the administrator/student relationship:

Delgado: I need time for more contact with the students.
Seattle: Sometimes access is too easy to my office. A student will come here to discuss a flare up with another staff member rather than deal with that person.
TVI: None, although I would like more time for contact with the students.

Suggested improvements in the administrator/student relationship came from the Delgado director, who wanted time for more contact with students, and from the TVI director, who wanted to see students become more active in student council functions.

Administrator/Parent Interaction. Administrators generally only had occasional contact with parents and that contact took the form of telephone, teletype and letter communication and in-person meetings. Reasons for contact concerned student progress, information about admissions, informal "getting to know you" meetings, and "to express appreciation for education the student had gotten."

Administrator/Counselor Interaction. The program administrators generally met informally with the program counselors to discuss student activities and problems, to disseminate information and delegate work responsibilities, to discuss administrative procedures, schedule changes, and the effects of the overall operation of the program. The Delgado administrator had no improvements to suggest in the administrator/program counselor relationship. The Seattle director saw the need for better vertical and horizontal communication, which might be helped by the emergence of a leader within the counseling program. The TVI program director wanted more time to communicate with the counselors.

Administrator/Preparatory Program Teacher Interaction. The program administrators met with the preparatory program teachers on a formal and informal basis to discuss administrative procedure, student progress in the classroom and needs, program needs, special events, special assignments, scheduling, money, and vocational exploration improvements. The Delgado program director suggested no improvements in the relationship. The Seattle director saw the need for a leader among the teachers, and the TVI director wanted more time to communicate with the teachers.

Administrator/Technical-Vocational Teacher Interaction. The program directors met with the technical-vocational teachers solely on an informal basis to discuss student classroom performance, interpreter performance, student objectives, teacher reaction to support services for deaf students, and, in TVI's case, to discuss their media program and public relations work. No improvements in the relationship were suggested by the Delgado program director. The Seattle director suggested that a better sequence of courses be

built in so that the teachers could upgrade their own skills in teaching the deaf. More time to talk with the teachers was wanted by the TVI director.

Administrator/Interpreter Interaction. The Seattle and TVI program directors met with interpreters on an informal and formal basis; the Delgado administrator met with them on an informal basis. Reasons for contact between the program directors and the interpreters included administrative procedure, special assignments, student or teacher problems, and student progress. The Delgado director had no improvements in the relationship to suggest. The Seattle administrator said that civil service support would go into effect giving interpreters more job stability. The TVI director expressed a wish for more formal meetings.

Staff Recruitment. Hiring policies for each position on the program staffs are presented in Table 21:

Student Job Placement. Placement procedure varied from program to program. The program directors described the following procedures:

Delgado: An appointment is set up for the deaf student and the position is discussed with the student. The student's strengths and interests are discussed with the employer.

Seattle: This is usually handled by the counselors. They survey employment opportunities for appropriateness. The student goes by himself or with an interpreter for an interview. Interpreter service is provided for first weeks of employment if requested.

TVI: We have contact through Employer Appreciation Days. Employers give awards for student achievement. Contacts through the state employment office and through meeting people socially. Unionized training teachers give tips on jobs. We call to ask for placement.

Student Withdrawals. The program directors gave the following reasons for student withdrawal from the program:

Delgado: Adjustment to the educational or community environment.
Financial support.
Personal reasons--marriage or family problems.

Seattle: Most withdraw for employment or because college training is not relevant to their immediate needs (personal adjustment).
Financial problems.

TVI: Some students peak out academically and leave.
Students dismissed due to drug behavior problems.
Home sickness.

Table 20

Hiring Policies for Staff Members as Given by Administrators

Program Counselors

| | |
|---|---|
| Delgado: | Experience with the deaf and interested in working with the deaf. I knew these people and knew they could communicate with people. B.A. degree in counseling. |
| Seattle: | B.A. degree, experience in working with deaf people, proficiency in manual communication, course work in counseling. |
| TVI: | M.A. degree. Had to meet the criteria for the city of St. Paul. Courses in counseling, including measurement and communication skills. |

Preparatory Program Teachers

| | |
|---|---|
| Delgado: | B.A. degree (not a teaching degree), experience in some related area, interest in working with the deaf and ability to get along with handicapped people. |
| Seattle: | B.A. degree and certification as teacher of the deaf. |
| TVI: | Teacher certification (vocationally certified), communication skills, and meeting the requirements of the city of St. Paul. |

Interpreters

| | |
|---|---|
| Delgado: | Ability to communicate. The individual is taken to a class and asked to interpret. |
| Seattle: | One year of experience in interpreting for the deaf. High school graduate or equivalent. |
| TVI: | Interpreters are picked from the TVI Interpreter Institute with minimum entry skills. Personal characteristics--relating ability. |

Notetakers

This was done on a voluntary basis at all programs.

Tutors

| | |
|---|---|
| Delgado: | Preparatory program teachers and interpreters act as tutors. |
| Seattle: | B.A. degree, certification as teacher of the deaf. |
| TVI: | Most tutoring is done through the program staff or special instructors in training areas. |

Agencies and personnel contacted to inform of withdrawals included the Vocational Rehabilitation counselors, speech and hearing centers, sheltered workshops, other schools, and community service functions.

Follow-Up Procedures. The program directors gave the following descriptions of their follow-up procedures:

Delgado: Information is accumulated concerning the students' employment whenever possible. Information is kept in student folder for future reference. Questionnaires are sent periodically to former students concerning progress.

Seattle: Formally, we have the University of Minnesota Research Component. Informally, we have general notion about where each graduate is through feedback from other students.

TVI: The procedure is sporadic--forms are sent out. We get information through word-of-mouth and memory.

Suggested improvements in the follow-up procedures included a uniform follow-up procedure for all programs, follow-up for evaluation of process, and a standard form to promote uniform reporting procedure.

Program Costs. Per pupil tuition costs for the Delgado program in 1973-74 were, according to the present program administrator, $110 per semester for state residents and $210 per semester for non-residents. Per pupil cost at the Seattle program--including tuition, fees, books and supplies, and dormitory facilities--was either $1,575 or $2,007 per year depending on student resident status. Per pupil costs at the TVI program were about $570 per year, not including room and board.

Per hour interpreter cost in 1973 was at:

Delgado: $4.10 to $5.00 at an estimated 500 hours per semester.
Seattle: $5.25 at an estimated 230-270 hours per quarter.
TVI: $3.50 at an estimated 300 hours per quarter.

There were no costs for notetakers since this function was carried out on a voluntary basis.

The Delgado program hired no tutors since many of their interpreters functioned also as tutors. The Seattle program employed seven tutors and, in addition, had three interpreters who also

functioned as tutors. Five to 10 tutors were used during the year at the TVI program.

There were no costs of student medical services to the programs, and no salaries were paid to audiologists or speech therapists (although the Seattle program paid $2500 in consultant fees to an audiologist.

Salaries of preparatory program teachers at each program were:

Delgado: $34,000
Seattle: $36,000
TVI: $48,000

Costs of other services included:

Delgado: A psychologist to administer the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale at $50 per student.
Seattle: A resident assistant at $600. The head interpreter was paid $10,000.
TVI: A recreation specialist paid at $5 per hour.

The Program Within the School. The program directors were asked what was done to promote student integration within the school. Their replies were:

Delgado: The students were invited to all school functions and activities in an informal manner.
Seattle: Interpreter services are provided for lectures (community-type things) and films. It is generally up to the individual.
TVI: The program builds up an equality attitude. Deaf people are not singled out. Athletic events are integrated.

All school facilities were open to the deaf students in each program, and all deaf program facilities were open to hearing students.

The deaf program administrators and school administrators conferred about the following matters:

Delgado: We discuss funding, budgets, program development and organization, or problems that may occur within the student body which warrant administration attention.
Seattle: We discuss general college operation and policies (program administrator was on President's executive board, a task force for the governor). The program administrator is totally involved in all college activities.
TVI: The business of TVI at large is discussed, space needs, graduation procedure, master scheduling.

The program administrators were asked what deaf program and school counselors conferred about. Their replies were:

Delgado: Student schedules, class requirements, student problems, etc.

Seattle: Primarily on advising matters--scheduling and appropriate sequence of courses.

TVI: They talk about the business of the day's activities, placements, scheduling, total school functioning.

The program directors were asked what the deaf program and the school teachers conferred about. Their replies were:

Delgado: They confer about supportive help, student strengths and weaknesses, and general student progress.

Seattle: They discuss getting supplementary materials to support the college faculty who have deaf students in their classes or obtaining materials for the preparatory program classes.

TVI: They discuss student-oriented matters--new texts, curriculum, revision of complementary areas.

# DISCUSSION

## Interviews

Students. The aspirations of the students have been shaped by the post-secondary programs. Most future occupations indicated were occupations the individual could train for in the technical/vocational setting. Future employment chosen by the students also fell within a relatively narrow range of course offerings, many choosing such "traditional" occupations for the deaf as printing (males) and general office practice (females). These choices would appear to reflect relatively low aspiration levels on the part of the students. On the other hand, nearly one-quarter of the students planned to attend college upon leaving the post-secondary programs, a trend contradictory to low aspirations and to the stated goals of the programs. The programs have also had an influence on the deaf students' choice of peers at school, most indicating they preferred to attend with both hearing and hearing-impaired students. This is consistent with former students' feelings (see Monograph II, External View; Fisher, Harlow & Moores, 1974) and in opposition to Boatner, Stuckless and Moores' findings (1964). Overall, the students presented positive opinions concerning the concept of regional technical/vocational centers for the deaf and the training they were receiving. They tended to view the programs in a pragmatic manner; that is, the programs provide the training necessary to obtain employment.

Preparatory Program Teachers. Few preparatory program teachers had experienced formal educational training directly related to education of the deaf, and only three possessed Master's degrees. The teachers were unanimous in their agreement upon the worth of the preparatory program. They felt such a program eased the student's transition into the technical/vocational setting, aided assessment of the student's capabilities and helped social adjustment. They also agreed that "hands-on" experience was vitally important for the deaf student. Direct contact with various forms of possible employment was thought to aid the student in choosing the correct area of training.

Program Counselors. Counselors found their roles insufficiently defined in relation to the students and other staff members, particularly in relation to the interpreters. Delgado and Seattle counselors felt the interpreters were abrogating some of their functions and misunderstood what a counselor could and could not accomplish. The situation at Delgado was further confused by the presence of the title "interpreter/counselor aide." Delgado counselors also complained of interference from administrators in counseling decisions, and at Delgado and TVI counselors felt that students did not understand the concept of counseling, in some cases because of previous experience on a disciplinary basis. TVI counselors complained of the tendency of technical/vocational teachers to view their function as a disciplinary one.

Many of the difficulties between the counselors and other members of the staff could be reduced by the presence of more specific job descriptions. Role boundaries would then be defined more completely and confusion of responsibility be eliminated. Job descriptions might also reduce the tendency of other staff members to view the counselor as being responsible for all aspects of the student's behavior.

In terms of education, the counselors, on the whole, appeared to have better preparation for their particular role than prep teachers and administrators. The majority were trained specifically as counselors.

Relieving the counselors of many of the administrative duties they now handle could improve the quality of counseling services. Counselors would then have more time to deal directly with students, and the need for more counselors might be reduced. The absence of female and deaf counselors also creates a gap in the services offered. Some counselors indicated they felt female students did not relate well to male counselors, or the counselors to them. The same was felt true of deaf student/hearing counselor interaction.

Counselors usually are the only individuals directly involved with students from time of application through training, placement and follow-up. As such they should have more of an overall perspective than others. To perform in their role adequately, they must be freed from all non-essential duties.

Interpreters. The interpreter is, in some ways, the most unique person in the programs for the deaf. The position allows the individual to be a constant source of information regarding all aspects of the program, and the interpreter is the one continuous link among all members of the program staff, the students, and the classroom teachers. The interpreter maintains a high rate of contact with the student and is instrumental in expressing his questions, desires, and frustrations to all concerned. The classroom teachers are nearly unanimous in expressing their support for the presence of the interpreters in the classroom and obviously regard them as the necessary catalyst permitting deaf students to undergo technical/vocational training with hearing students. The close contact with students does give rise to difficulty. In the program counselor's eyes, a dependency is developed, and interpreters may attempt to assume the functions of a counselor or be critical of a counselor's efforts if a problem is not immediately solved. This particular problem was mentioned by the Delgado and Seattle counselors, but not by the TVI counselors. Clearer role definition may result at TVI because interpreters are obtained from the TVI Interpreter Institute. Interpreters are trained to the standards of the program which permits uniformity of skills and background. The existence of such an institute also provides a readily available pool of interpreters rather than forcing the programs to rely on what is available in the community.

The idea of interpreter as tutor is attractive. No other individual has such close contact with the student regarding academic matters, and many of the technical/vocational teachers argued that the interpreter should have a good knowledge of the subject matter he is interpreting. If interpreters were trained to function also as tutors, students would have ready access to information sources, and technical/vocational teachers would have more confidence in the interpreters in their classrooms.

An obvious needed skill for an interpreter is the ability to transmit concepts fluently while interpreting. Most interpreters indicated they switched from word-for-word translation to actual interpretation, depending on the student and the nature of the class. Interpreting skills, rather than translation skills, would appear to be of more

importance. Ability to interpret might be dependent upon knowledge of the particular subject.

Regular Classroom Teachers. Technical/vocational instructors were nearly unanimous in their support for the programs for the deaf. They were enthusiastic about the goals of the programs and appeared in many cases to regard the deaf student as a stimulating challenge in the classroom. The teachers had many questions about the deaf students and their capabilities, indicating a need to provide them with appropriate information and orientation. The provision of such background material would enable the instructors to better deal with the deaf student once he is in the regular classroom. Many teachers indicated they slowed their teaching pace for the benefit of deaf students. Most, however, did not consider this to have a detrimental effect upon classroom interaction; instead, they found it made them better teachers and hearing students benefitted from the slower pace.

The technical/vocational instructors were utilized as a source for placement by the Seattle program, in particular. Many of the instructors are highly respected for their expertise in their particular areas and have close ties with unions and industry. They provided a continuing source of job information and aided the program counselors in placement of students. This pooling of efforts appeared to provide an effective form of placement.

Administrators. The technical/vocational setting of the programs for the deaf would appear to require a unique combination of educational backgrounds on the part of a program director, at least in an ideal sense. Knowledge of teaching techniques, both in the technical/vocational classroom and in the hearing-impaired classroom, could form an important part of an administrator's overall expertise. Administrative talents and training are also an obvious necessity. This need for a multiplicity of talents is evident when one considers that the director must coordinate and supervise a preparatory program component, a counseling component, liason with technical/vocational teachers and administration, the students themselves, contact with the community

and employers, and funding for the program.

It is of interest to note that not one of the three administrators was a certified teacher of the deaf, and that none majored in educational administration or counseling in college. Two received degrees in audiology and one in education. Whether or not training in one of the three above mentioned areas would have increased the effectiveness of an administrator is unclear.

Each program reflected the particular philosophy of the director. The Delgado and TVI administrators had relatively specific expectations for their graduates--at Delgado, to obtain employment, at TVI, to obtain employment at a level higher than possible without training. The Seattle director stated broader expectations for a graduate--to be able to define his own life objectives and to be able to accomplish those objectives. Expectations for a nongraduate reflected the same kind of thinking. The Delgado and TVI administrators expected the same for a nongraduate. Nongraduates at Seattle were expected to use other services available to them better than they could use those at Seattle.

Supportive Services

A basic need for all three programs would appear to be the addition of a research or follow-up component. Admissions and placement (in the program and on the job) procedures are presently handled by the counselors. Follow-up procedures are haphazard or casual. Consolidation of these areas would provide systematic data on each student and relieve counselors of duties that take time away from counseling chores. In location of former students now employed, the Minnesota research team found it necessary to rely on each program's often informal knowledge of where each former student was living and employed. Analysis of audiological data was impossible due to inconsistencies in student file folders--it was often not possible to determine what standard was employed, when the student was tested, or where he was tested. Much of the confusion was generated as noted by the TVI administrator, by the lack of standard record-keeping procedures throughout the system of deaf education. Inconsistencies were also found in test data. Different forms of the same test were sometimes administered to students, making comparisons of data useless. The

addition of a research component could ease administrative chores, make each member of the staff more effective within respective roles, and provide an effective quality check, pinpointing the strengths and weaknesses within each program.

The addition of specialists to the programs might also enhance effort. At least one of the preparatory teachers should be an individual versed in diagnostic, remedial techniques, particularly in language, reading and math. A form of liason could establish systematic educational input for the students. An audiologist, or an individual with comparable training, could monitor effectively audiological data and have the capacity of diagnosing particular student strengths and weaknesses where the listening function is concerned. A speech therapist, with a strong language background, could do much to ameliorate diagnosed weaknesses.

## SUMMARY

1) Desired future occupations noted by students attending the post-secondary programs for the deaf tended to fall within the realm of technical/vocational course offerings; that is, few jobs were chosen for which training was not offered in the technical/vocational setting. Occupational choices tended to be along "traditional" and sex lines. Nearly 40% of the males chose graphic arts/printing and cabinet making/carpentry as their future occupations. Sixty percent of the females chose as their future occupation jobs that would come under the category General Office Practice (keypunching, clerk/typist, etc.). Almost 1/4 of the students planned to attend college upon leaving school. Most students approved of the idea of technical/vocational programs for the hearing-impaired, and most preferred to attend school with both hearing and hearing-impaired peers. Nearly 90% of the students were satisfied with the training they were receiving.

2) One of nine preparatory program teachers had received a degree in education of the deaf. Three of nine teachers possessed Master's degrees. The teachers were nearly unanimous in agreeing on the worth of the preparatory programs for deaf students, stating that the programs 1) provided the student generally unready for a technical/vocational environment with an adequate background, 2) gave the student a chance to assess his future and objectives, and 3) provided the student with a realistic exposure to job situations.

3) Program counselors found their roles insufficiently defined in relation to the students and other staff members, particularly the interpreters. Delgado counselors felt that interpreters were assuming some of their functions and that administrators were interfering with counseling decisions. TVI counselors thought that students sometimes had a negative view of counselors, because of past experience on a disciplinary basis. Delgado counselors felt that some students did not understand the concept of counseling and did not know how to use the service. Administrative duties required of the counselors ranged from 0 to 50% of their time, depending upon the program and the counselor's function within that program.

4) The technical/vocational teachers were supportive of and enthusiastic about the programs for the deaf. They were particularly appreciative of the interpreters in their classrooms. The teachers expressed a desire for the interpreters to be knowledgeable in the subjects they were interpreting and wanted to keep the same interpreters from previous sessions.

5) Interpreters were in the unique position of having considerable contact with everyone involved in the programs--students, staff, and technical/vocational teachers. Their frequent contact with students sometimes lead to difficulties, as noted previously, in relation to the counselors. TVI interpreters were trained by the TVI Interpreter Institute. This may perhaps provide clearer role definition and a steady source of interpreters for the TVI program. Interpreters both interpreted and translated word-for-word, depending on the student and the class.

6) None of the three administrators was trained at the Bachelor's or Master's degree level in education of the deaf. None had degrees in educational administration and/or supervision. The position of director of a program for the deaf would appear, in an ideal sense, to require a unique combination of experience or training. Knowledge is required of classroom techniques, for both deaf and hearing, in an academic and technical/vocational setting, counseling functions, and administrative techniques.

7) A need was noted for the consolidation of admissions, placement, and follow-up functions. It was felt this would relieve some counselors of non-counseling responsibilities and eliminate the sometimes haphazard follow-up procedures maintained by the programs. It would also have the effect of standardizing data collection, maintenance and analysis, allowing the staff to better meet student needs. It was also felt that the addition of a "communication" specialist or a speech therapist with specific training in communication remedial techniques, and an audiologist would better enable the programs to prepare the students for technical/vocational training.

References

Barnes, H. B. A co-operative job training center for deaf--if! American Annals of the Deaf, 1940, 85, 347-350 (a).

Barnes, H. B. The need for separating advanced vocational training from the elementary school atmosphere. American Annals of the Deaf, 1940, 85, 449-451.

Boatner, E. G., Stuckless, E. R., and Moores, D. F. The occupational status of the young deaf adult of New England and the need and demand for a regional technical-vocational training center. West Hartford, Connecticut: American School for the Deaf, 1964.

Brochure. Improved vocational, technical and academic opportunities for deaf persons. New Orleans, Louisiana Delgado Junior College.

Brochure. Technical vocational program for deaf students. St. Paul. Minnesota: Technical Vocational Institute, 1969.

Bulletin, St. Paul Area Technical Vocational Institute. St. Paul, Minnesota, 1970.

Craig, W. N. and Burrows, N. L. Improved vocational, technical and academic opportunities for deaf people: Research component. University of Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1969.

Craig, W. N., Newman, J. and Burrows, N. L. An experiment in post-secondary education for deaf people. American Annals of the Deaf, 1972, 117, 606-611.

Delgado Junior College 1972-73 General Catalog. New Orleans, Louisiana: Delgado Junior College, 1972.

Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Vol. I and II, 3rd Edition; U. S. Department of Labor, 1965, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

Fay, E. (Ed.). American Annals of the Deaf and Dumb, 1871, 16.

Fay, E. Report of the committee on a technical school. American Annals of the Deaf and Dumb, 1893, 38, 279-280.

Fisher, S., Harlow, M. J., & Moores, D. Post-secondary programs for the deaf, Monograph II, External View. Research Report #61, Research, Development and Demonstration Center in Education of Handicapped Children, University of Minnesota, March 1974.

Fusfeld, I. S. (Ed.). National Research Council's committee on the survey of schools for the deaf. American Annals of the Deaf, 1926, 71, 284-348.

Gronenberg, L. D. and Glass, G. D. Young deaf adults: An occupational survey. Hot Springs, Arkansas: Arkansas Rehabilitation Service, 1966.

Lunde, A. S. and Bigman, S. K. Occupational conditions among the deaf. Washington, D. C.: Gallaudet College, 1959.

Moores, D. F. The vocational status of young deaf adults in Maryland, Journal of Rehabilitation of the Deaf, 1969, 2, 39-41.

Moores, D., Barlow, M. J., & Fisher, S. Post-secondary programs for the deaf, Monograph I, Introduction. Research Report No. [illegible], Development and Demonstration Center in Education of Handicapped Children. University of Minnesota, [illegible], 1974.

Morrison, L. . Industrial training: What shall we subtract, and what shall we add, in the new century of the deaf? American Annals of the Deaf, 1920, 65, 213-224.

North Seattle Community College Catalog 1973-1974. Seattle, Washington: Seattle Community College District, 1973.

Robinson, ., Fink, A. & Axling, P. The industrial status of the deaf. American Annals of the Deaf, 1904, 49, 460-464.

Rogers, B. . A plea for a polytechnic institute for deaf-mutes. American Annals of the Deaf, 1888, 33, 184-185.

Rosenstein, J. and Ferman, A. Vocational status and the adjustment of deaf women. Lexington School for the Deaf Res. Series, 1963.

Seattle Central Community College 1973-1974 Catalog. Seattle, Washington: Seattle Community College District, 1973.

South Seattle Community College 1973-1974 Catalog. Seattle, Washington: Seattle Community College District, 1973.

Stuckless, E. R. and Delgado, G. L. A guide to college/career programs for deaf students. Rochester, New York: National Technical Institute for the Deaf: Washington, D. C.: Gallaudet College, 1973.

Trisler, . S. (Ed.). A guide to educational programs for deaf students at Seattle Community College. Seattle, Washington: Seattle Community College, 1973.

APPENDIX A

# INTERVIEW WITH YOUNG DEAF ADULT (Current Student)

I. Vital Information Date _____

a. Name _____

b. Birthdate _____

c. Male or female _____

d. Address _____ Phone _____

e. Parents

(1) Name _____

(2) Address _____ Phone _____

f. Marital Status

(1) Married ____ (a) number of children ____

(2) Single ____ (a) engaged ____

(b) go steady ____

(c) neither ____

(3) Divorced ____

g. Is your wife (husband) deaf ____ hard of hearing ____ hearing ____?

h. Are you

working (employed) ____

housewife ____

student ____

None ____

(If "none", explain, i.e., unemployed, etc. ____

i. What school are you attending now? _____

_____

II. Occupational Status (do not ask II, III or IV if continuous student)

a. Jobs (begin with present job and work back to first job)

1. Company _____ Address _____

Description of work _____

_____

Date of employment _____

Still working there _____

Reason for departure _____

Date of departure _____

2. Company_____ Address_____
   Description of work _____
   _____
   Dates of employment_____
   Reason for departure_____
3. Company_____ Address_____
   Description of work_____
   _____
   Dates of employment_____
   Reason for departure_____
4. Company_____ Address_____
   Description of work_____
   _____
   Dates of employment_____
   Reason for departure_____

III. Job Satisfaction and Communication (Ask III if presently employed full or part time)

a. How did you find your job? (Vocational Rehab., want ad, employment service, friend, parents, school, etc.)
   _____

b. Do you like your job?
   like it very much_____ o.k._____ dislike most things about it _____

c. Why do you feel this way about your job?_____
   _____
   _____

d. Do you want to keep your job or would you want to change?
   Keep my job_____ Change jobs_____

e. If the answer is "Change Jobs" why do you want to change?
   _____
   _____

f. How do you communicate with your boss (immediate supervisor)?
   speech_____ writing_____ formal signs_____ natural gestures_____

g. Does your boss understand you?
   always_____ most of the time_____ sometimes_____ never_____

h. How does your boss communicate with you?

speech_____ writing_____ formal signs_____ natural gestures_____

i. Do you understand your boss?

always _____ most of the time_____ sometimes _____ never_____

j. What is the easiest means of communication?

speech_____ writing_____ formal signs_____ natural gestures_____

other_____ (specify)_____

k. Do you think your boss would give you a better job if one were available? Yes_____ No_____ Not sure_____

l. If "no," why?_____

_____

_____

IV. Economic Status (Ask Part IV only if presently employed full or part time).

a. Do you work full time? _____

Average no. of hours _____

Do you work part time? _____

Average no. of hours _____

b. Not including overtime, what is your gross and net pay (indicate both)?_____

c. Do you ever work overtime? Yes_____ No_____

d. If yes, how much money, on the average, do you make each week on overtime?_____

e. Do you receive financial help from anyone? (excluding husband or wife)._____

f. If "yes" from whom? Give average weekly amount. (count room and board at $15.00 per week).

Source_____ Average weekly amount_____

V. Aspirations

a. What occupation would you like to have in ten years? (Person may choose homemaker.)

_____

b. Do you think that you will have that occupation in ten years?
Yes_____ No_____ Not sure_____

c. Would this job require more training?
Yes_____ No_____ Kind of training_____

d. If the answer to b. is "no" or "not sure," why won't you have that job?_____

e. Would you prefer to go to school with:
hearing students_____ deaf students_____ both_____
makes no difference_____

f. Why?_____

g. Do you like the idea of a vocational and technical school for young deaf people who do not go to a school such as Gallaudet?
Yes_____ No_____ Not sure_____

h. Why?_____

VI. Students (To be asked in addition to Sections I and V.)

a. When you leave this school what do you plan to do?
(1) go to college_____
(2) go to work_____
a. what kind of work will you look for?_____
(3) other (explain)_____
(4) undecided_____

b. Have you ever had any summer or part time job?_____

c. If "yes" describe:_____

VII. Satisfaction with training (both present and past students)

a. Are you satisfied with the training you received (are receiving) at this school?_____

b. If the answer to a. is "no," why are you not satisfied with the training?_____

_____

_____

(1) Location_____

(2) Duration in minutes_____

(3) Interviewer_____

APPENDIX B

PREPARATORY PROGRAM TEACHER INTERVIEW FORM

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

a. Teacher's name: _____

b. Teacher is: hearing _____ deaf _____ hard of hearing _____

c. Subject(s) taught: _____

d. Name of school: _____

II. EDUCATION

a. Circle the number of years of education the teacher has had.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

b. If you've graduated from college, in what field(s) did you receive your degree(s)? _____

_____

c. How many years of teacher training have you had? _____

d. How much practicum have you had in teaching? _____

e. How many years of training in teaching the deaf have you had? _____

f. How much practicum have you had in teaching the deaf? _____

g. Where did you acquire your interpreting and communication skills (i.e., fingerspelling, sign language, etc.)?

_____

h. If acquired in a formal program, please name and describe.

_____ _____

_____

III. EMPLOYMENT

a. Prior to your current job, what experience have you had teaching the deaf?

_____

_____ _____

b. What experience have you had with the deaf, other than teaching experience?

_____



_____

c. What teaching experience have you had with students other than deaf students?

_____

_____

d. If you have had no teaching experience, how were you previously employed?

_____

_____

e. How did you become aware of the availability of your current employment?

_____

_____

f. What were the requirements, if any, for acquisition of your current employment?

_____

_____

g. On what basis were you chosen to teach your subject area?

_____

_____

IV. COMMUNICATION AND INTERACTION WITH STUDENTS

a. How do you communicate with the deaf students in your classes?
speech and speech reading _____ fingerspelling _____
sign language _____ writing _____ gestures _____ other _____

b. What percentage of the deaf students do you communicate with adequately? _____

c. How much of the deaf students' communication - no matter what form it takes - do you understand?
all of it _____ most of it _____ some of it _____
none of it _____

d. For those students whose communication you don't understand, what means do you employ to understand them?

_____

_____

e. How much of the deaf students' speech do you understand?
all of it ___ most of it ___ some of it ___ none of it ___

f. What do you consider to be your strengths in communicating with the deaf?

_____

_____

g. What do you consider to be your weaknesses in communicating with the deaf?

_____

_____

h. What do you consider to be the deaf students' strengths in communicating with you?

_____

_____

i. What do you consider to be the deaf students' weaknesses in communicating with you?

_____

_____

j. What do you consider to be your strengths in teaching the deaf?

_____

_____

k. What do you consider to be your weaknesses in teaching the deaf?

_____

_____

l. How would you rate yourself as a teacher of the deaf?
excellent ___ above average ___ average ___ below average ___

m. Do you make yourself available to the deaf students for subject review or extra work? Yes _____ No _____

n. If so, how frequently? _____

o. Do deaf students bring their problems to you? Yes ___ No ___

p. What are the academic problems that are most frequently brought to you by the deaf students?

q. What are the family problems that are most frequently brought to you by deaf students?

r. What are the social problems that are most frequently brought to you by deaf students?

s. What are the other problems that are most frequently brought to you by deaf students?

t. Do you deal with these problems yourself or do you refer the students to someone else? _____

Explain:

V. SUBJECT COMPREHENSION

a. Do you feel that the deaf students understand the subject matter adequately? Yes _____ No _____

b. If not, why do you feel that the deaf student does not have adequate comprehension?

VI. TEACHER/INTERPRETER INTERACTION

a. How many times per school quarter do you confer with interpreters? _____

b. Do you meet with interpreters on a scheduled basis or on an informal basis? _____

c. Do you seek the interpreters out or do they look for you?

d. For what reasons, generally, do you contact interpreters?

e. For what reasons, generally, do interpreters contact you?

f. What improvements in teacher/interpreter cooperation and communication would you suggest?

VII. TEACHER/COUNSELOR INTERACTION

a. How often per school quarter do you confer with counselors?

b. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with counselors regardless of whether problems do or do not exist?

Yes ___ No ___

c. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

d. Do you meet with counselors informally? Yes ___ No ___

e. If so, do you seek the counselors out or do they look for you?

f. For what reasons, generally, do you contact counselors?

g. For what reasons, generally, do counselors contact you?

h. What improvements in teacher/counselor communication and cooperation would you suggest?

VIII. TEACHER/ADMINISTRATOR INTERACTION

a. Who is your immediate superior (i.e. person who oversees the prep program)?

b. How often do you confer with your immediate superior during a school quarter?

c. What do you confer about?

d. How often do you confer with other administrators during a school quarter?

e. Name the administrators you confer with other than your immediate superior.

f. What do you confer about?

g. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with administrators during a school quarter? Yes ___ No ___

h. If so, when are these meetings scheduled and what is generally discussed?

i. Do you meet with administrators informally? Yes ___ No ___

j. If so, do you seek the administrators out or do they look for you?

k. For what reasons, generally, do you contact administrators?

l. For what reasons, generally, do administrators contact you?

m. What improvements in teacher/administrator communication and cooperation would you suggest?

IX. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE PREPARATORY PROGRAM

a. Do you think the preparatory program is beneficial to the deaf students? Yes ____ No ____

b. Why?

c. Do the deaf students think that the preparatory program is beneficial to their education?
Yes ____ No ____ don't know ____

d. Why?

e. What are the goals of the preparatory program?

f. How are these goals achieved?

g. Do you think that the course you teach is valuable to the program? Yes _____ No _____

h. Why? _____

i. Do you think that the other courses available in the program are beneficial to the students? Yes _____ No _____

j. Why? _____

k. What improvements in the preparatory program would you make?

X. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

# APPENDIX C

# SCHOOL COUNSELOR INTERVIEW FORM

## I. GENERAL INFORMATION

a. Name of Counselor _____

b. Counselor is: hearing____ deaf____ hard of hearing____

c. Name of school _____

## II. EDUCATION

a. Circle the number of years of education the counselor has had.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

b. If you've graduated from college; in what field did you receive your degree(s)?

_____

_____

c. How many years of counseling training have you had? _____

d. How much practicum have you had in counseling? _____

e. Where did you acquire your counseling skills? _____

f. Where did you acquire your interpreting and communication skills (i.e., signing, fingerspelling, etc.)?

_____

g. If acquired in a formal program, please name and describe the program.

_____

## III. EMPLOYMENT

a. Prior to your current employment, what experience, if any, have you had in counseling the deaf?

_____

_____

b. What was the size of your case load? _____

c. What previous experience have you had with the deaf, other than counseling experience? _____

_____

d. What counseling experience have you had with people other than deaf clients?

_____

_____

f. If you have had no counseling experience, how were you previously employed?

g. How did you become aware of the availability of your current employment?

h. What were the requirements, if any, for acquisition of your current employment?

IV. REFERRAL PROCEDURES

a. What types of agencies and personnel do you inform of program opportunities for the deaf?

b. How do you inform appropriate agencies and personnel of program opportunities for deaf clients?

c. From what source(s) do you receive information about prospective students?

d. What do you consider to be the strengths of the referral procedure presently employed?

e. What do you consider to be the weaknesses of the referral procedure presently employed?

f. What changes, if any, would you make in the present referral procedures?

V. STUDENT PLACEMENT WITHIN THE PROGRAM

a. Do you utilize test scores (i.e., GATB results) in placement of a student within a particular subject area?

Yes____ No____

b. What test measures are utilized to place a student within a subject area?

c. What criteria other than test scores are used to place a student within a subject area?

d. What do you consider to be the strengths of your present placement procedure?

e. What do you consider to be the weaknesses of your present placement procedure?

f. What changes, if any, would you make in the present placement procedure?

VI. COMMUNICATION WITH STUDENTS

a. In general, how do you communicate with the students?

speech and speech reading____ fingerspelling____

sign language____ writing____ gestures____ interpreter aid____

other____

b. What percentage of the deaf students do you communicate with adequately? _____

c. How much of their communication - no matter what form it takes - do you understand?

all of it____ most of it____ some of it____

d. For those students whose communication you don't understand, what means do you employ to fully understand them?

_____

_____

e. What do you consider to be your strengths in communicating with the deaf?

_____

_____

f. What do you consider to be your weaknesses in communicating with the deaf?

_____

_____

g. In general, what do you consider to be the deaf clients' strengths in communicating with you?

_____

_____

h. In general, what do you consider to be the deaf clients' weaknesses in communicating with you?

_____

_____

VII. INTERACTION WITH STUDENTS

a. What percentage of your time per school quarter do you devote to student counseling? _____

b. How many students per school quarter do you counsel? _____

c. How much time, on the average, do you spend with each student during a school quarter?

_____

d. Do you have to persuade the students to use your counseling services?

Yes____ No____

e. If so, why do you have to persuade the students to use your counseling services?

_____

_____

f. Are appointments with students made on a regular basis or are problems handled as they come up?

g. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with students, regardless of whether problems do or do not exist?

h. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter?

i. Do you meet with students informally?

Yes____ No____

j. If so, do you generally seek the students out or do they look for you?

k. For what reasons, generally, do you contact students?

l. What are the classroom problems most frequently brought to you by the deaf students? List in order of frequency.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

m. What are the family problems most frequently brought to you by the deaf students? List in order of frequency.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

n. What are the employment problems most frequently brought to you by the deaf students? List in order of frequency.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

o. What are the other problems most frequently brought to you by the deaf students? List in order of frequency.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

p. What do you consider to be the strengths of the present counseling procedure?

q. What do you consider to be the weaknesses of the present counseling procedure?

r. What changes, if any, would you make in the present counseling procedure?

VIII. INTERACTION WITH PARENTS

a. What percentage of your time per school quarter do you devote to parent conferences? _____

b. For what reasons, generally, do you desire meeting with parents of students?

c. For what reasons, generally, do parents of students desire meeting with you?

d. What form do counselor-parent conferences take the majority of the time?

telephone____ TTY____ letter____ in person____ other_____

e. What other forms do counselor-parent conferences take?

telephone____ TTY____ letter____ in person____ other_____

f. What improvements in counselor/parent relationship would you suggest?

IX. INTERACTION WITH PREPARATORY PROGRAM TEACHERS

a. How often do you communicate with the prep-program teachers during a school quarter?

frequently____ occasionally____ never_____

b. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with prep-program teachers, regardless of whether problems do or do not exist?

Yes____ No____

c. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

_____

_____

d. Do you meet with pre-program teachers informally?

Yes____ No____

e. If so, do you seek the prep-program teachers out or do they look for you? _____

f. For what reasons, generally, do you contact prep-program teachers?

_____

_____

g. For what reasons, generally, do prep-program teachers contact you?

_____

_____

h. What improvements in the counselor/prep-program teacher relationship would you suggest?

_____

_____

IX. INTERACTION WITH TECHNICAL VOCATIONAL TEACHERS

a. How often do you communicate with the technical vocational teachers during a school quarter?

frequently____ occasionally____ never____

b. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with vocational technical teachers regardless of whether problems do or do not exist?

Yes _____ No_____

c. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

_____

_____

d. Do you meet with vocational technical teachers informally?

Yes____ No____

e. If so, do you seek the technical vocational teachers out or do they look for you?

f. For what reasons, generally, do you contact vocational technical teachers?

g. For what reasons, generally, do vocational technical teachers contact you?

h. What improvements in the counselor/technical vocational teacher relationship would you suggest?

i. What percentage of your time per quarter do you devote to communicating with prep-program and technical vocational teachers?_____.

XI. INTERACTION WITH INTERPRETERS

a. What percentage of your time per quarter is devoted to communicating with interpreters? _____

b. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with interpreters, regardless of whether problems do or do not exist?

c. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

d. Do you meet with interpreters informally?

Yes____ No____

e. If so, do you seek the interpreters out or do they look for you?

f. For what reasons, generally, do you contact interpreters?

g. For what reasons, generally, do interpreters contact you?

h. What improvements in the counselor/interpreter relationship would you suggest?

XII. INTERACTION WITH ADMINISTRATORS

a. What percentage of your time per school quarter is devoted to communicating with administrators? _____

b. What percentage of your time is devoted to administrative duties?

c. Describe your administrative duties.

d. Is there a formal schedule for meeting with administrators?

Yes____ No____

e. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

f. Do you meet with administrators informally?

Yes____ No____

g. If so, do you seek the administrators out or do they contact you?

h. For what reasons, generally, do administrators contact you?

i. For what reasons, generally, do you contact administrators?

j. What improvements in the counselor/administrator relationship would you suggest?

XIII. STUDENT PLACEMENT

a. Do you contact prospective employers?

Yes____ No____

b. Do prospective employers contact you?

Yes____ No____

c. What is the procedure for placement when you contact prospective employers?

d. What is the procedure for placement when prospective employers contact you?

e. Do you ever visit the former student and his employer on the job?

Yes____ No____

f. If you do visit former students and their employers on the job, what generally are the problems discussed?

g. What complaints are heard most from employers?

h. What complaints are heard most from the deaf employees?

i. What do the employers list as the most positive aspects of their deaf employees?

j. How much contact, generally, do you have with a student once he has a job (other than on the job contact)?

continual____ sporadic____ seldom____ never____

k. Do you ever interpret at employment evaluation interviews for graduates from the program?

Yes____ No____

l. Do you think the employee/ employer relationship would be improved by increased contacts with you or some other deaf consultant?

Yes____ No____

m. If so, what exactly would you propose?

_____

_____

_____

XIV. WITHDRAWALS

a. What are the reasons, generally, for the withdrawal of a deaf student from the technical vocational program? List in order of frequency.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

b. How much contact, generally, do you have with a student once he has withdrawn from the program?

continual____ sporadic____ seldom____ never____

c. Do you refer the student to an agency or rehabilitation counselor once he has decided to withdraw from the program?

Yes____ No____

d. What types of agencies and personnel do you contact?

_____

_____

_____

XV. FOLLOW-UP

a. Describe, briefly, the program's follow-up procedures.

_____

_____

_____

_____

b. What improvements would you make in the current follow-up procedures and why?

XVI. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

XVII. SCHOOL RELATIONS

a. Do you confer with school counselors?

Yes____ No____

b. What do you confer about?

c. With what other school staff do you confer?

d. What do you confer about?

# APPENDIX D

# TEACHER INTERVIEW FORM

## I. GENERAL INFORMATION

a. Teacher's name: _____

b. Teacher is: hearing_____ deaf_____ hard of hearing _____

c. Subject(s) taught: _____

d. Name of school: _____

## II. EMPLOYMENT

a. Prior to your current job, what experience, if any, have you had teaching the deaf?

_____

_____

b. What experience have you had with the deaf, other than teaching experience?

_____

_____

## III. COMMUNICATION AND INTERACTION

a. Do you communicate directly with deaf students in your classes?

Yes____ No_____

b. How do you communicate with the deaf students in your classes?

speech and speech reading_____ fingerspelling_____

sign language____ writing_____ gestures____ interpreter aid____

other _____

c. How much of the deaf students' communication--no matter what form it takes--do you understand?

all of it____ most of it____ some of it____ none of it____

If you do not fully understand the deaf students' communication, what means do you employ to fully understand it?

_____

_____

d. How much of the deaf students' speech do you understand?

all of it_____ most of it_____ some of it_____ none of it_____

e. Do the hearing students and the deaf students in your classes interact with each other?

Yes_____ No_____

f. If yes, how do the deaf students and hearing students communicate with each other?

speech and speech reading_____ fingerspelling_____

sign language_____ gestures_____ writing_____ interpreter aid_____

other_____

g. How often do the hearing students and the deaf students in your classes communicate with each other?

always____ most of the time____ seldom____ never____

h. Do you slow down your teaching pace for the benefit of the deaf students in your classes?

Yes _____ No_____

i. If so, how do the other students react? _____

_____

_____

_____

j. Do you make your class notes and/or class outline available to the deaf students?

Yes_____ No_____

k. Do you make these materials available to the rest of your students?

Yes_____ No_____

l. Do you make yourself available to deaf students for subject review or extra work?

Yes_____ No_____

m. If so, how frequently? _____

n. What do you consider to be the strengths of teaching an integrated (deaf and hearing) class?

_____

_____

_____

o. What do you consider to be the weaknesses (problems) of teaching an integrated class?

_____

_____

_____

p. What improvements in the integrated classroom situation would you suggest?

_____

_____

_____

IV. SUBJECT COMPREHENSION

a. Do you feel that the deaf students understand the subject matter adequately?

Yes____ No____

b. If not, why do you feel that the deaf student does not have adequate comprehension?

_____

_____

V. TEACHER/INTERPRETATOR INTERACTION

a. If you have interpreter aid available, do you find this service valuable?

Yes____ No____

b. If yes, in what way is interpreter aid valuable?

_____

_____

c. If no, why is interpreter aid not valuable?

_____

_____

d. What percentage of your time is devoted to communicating with interpreter(s) during a school quarter? _____

e. Do you make class notes and outlines available to the interpreter(s)?

Yes____ No____

f. When do you make these materials available to the interpreter(s)?

_____

g. Do you work with the interpreters in developing and incorporating new sign language vocabulary for each subject area?

Yes____ No____

h. If so, how is this done? _____

_____

_____

_____

i. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with interpreters regardless of whether problems do or do not exist?

Yes____ No____

j. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

_____

_____

k. Do you see interpreters informally?

Yes____ No_____

l. If so, do you seek the interpreters out or do they look for you?

_____

m. For what reasons, generally, do you contact interpreters?

_____

_____

_____

n. For what reasons, generally, do interpreters contact you?

_____

_____

_____

o. What improvements in teacher/interpreter cooperation and communication would you suggest?

_____

_____

_____

p. Are note taking services available to the deaf students?

Yes_____ No_____

q. Do the deaf students make use of the note taking services available?

Yes _____ No_____

VI. TEACHER/COUNSELOR INTERACTION

a. What percentage of your time is devoted to communicating with counselors during a school quarter?

b. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with counselors of deaf students regardless of whether problems do or do not exist?

Yes____ No _____

c. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

_____

_____

d. Do you see these counselors informally?

Yes____ No____

e. If so, do you seek the counselors out or do they look for you?

f. For what reasons, generally, do you contact counselors?

g. For what reasons, generally, do counselors contact you?

h. What improvements in teacher/counselor communication and cooperation would you suggest?

VII. TEACHER/DEAF PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR INTERACTION

a. What percentage of your time is devoted to communicating with administrators during a school quarter?

b. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with administrators of deaf students regardless of whether problems do or do not exist?

Yes_____ No_____

c. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

d. Do you see these administrators informally?

Yes_____ No_____

e. If so, do you seek the administrators out or do they look for you?

f. For what reasons, generally, do you contact administrators?

g. For what reasons, generally, do administrators contact you?

h. What improvements in teacher/administrator communication and cooperation would you suggest?

XIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

# APPENDIX E

# INTERPRETER INTERVIEW FORM

## I. GENERAL INFORMATION

a. Interpreter's name: _____

b. Name of school: _____

c. Number of interpreters in deaf program: _____

## II. EDUCATION

a. Circle the number of years of education you've had:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

b. If you've graduated from college, in what field did you receive your degree?

_____

c. If you are currently in school, what is your major area of study?

_____

d. Do you intend to continue your education? Yes____ No____

If yes, elaborate: _____

_____

e. Where did you acquire your interpreting skills (i.e., signing and fingerspelling)?

_____

Briefly describe the training program: _____

_____

_____

_____

f. How many weeks/months/years of interpreter training did you receive?

_____

g. How much practicum have you had in interpreting? _____

h. How long have you been interpreting for the deaf? _____

i. What made you decide to become an interpreter for the deaf?

_____

_____

_____

_____

III. EMPLOYMENT

a. Prior to your current job, what expe ience, if any, have you had as an interpreter for the deaf?

b. What experience have you had with the deaf, other than interpreting experience?

c. If you have had no interpreting experience, how were you previously employed?

d. How did you become aware of the availability of your current job?

e. What were the stated requirements for acquisition of your current job?

IV. COMMUNICATION AND INTERACTION

a. How do you communicate with the deaf students in your classes?

speech and speech reading____ fingerspelling____

sign language____ writing____ gestures____

other_____

b. What percentage of the deaf students for whom you interpret do you understand? _____

c. How much of their communication - no matter what form it takes - do you understand?

all of it____ most of it____ some of it____ none of it____

d. With those students whom you communicate do not understand, what means do you employ to fully understand them?

e. How much, in general, of the deaf students' speech do you understand?

all of it____ most of it____ some of it____ none of it____

f. Do the deaf and hearing students in your class interact with each other?

Yes____ No____

g. If yes, how do the deaf and hearing students communicate with each other?

speech and speech reading____ fingerspelling____

sign language____ writing____ gestures____ interpreter aid____

other_____

h. How often do the hearing students and the deaf students in your classes communicate with each other?

always____ most of the time____ seldom____ never____

i. Do the deaf students and teachers in your classes communicate with each other?

Yes____ No____

j. If yes, how do the deaf students and teachers communicate with each other?

speech and speech reading____ fingerspelling____

sign language____ writing____ gestures____ interpreter aid____

other _____

k. How often do the deaf students and teachers in your classes communicate with each other?

always____ most of the time____ seldom____ never____

V. INTERPRETING SKILLS

a. How many school subjects do you interpret? _____

Name them: _____

_____

_____

_____

b. Do you consider yourself to be knowledgeable in these subject areas?

Yes____ No____

Name the subject areas in which you are knowledgeable.

_____

_____

_____

c. How many subjects do you tutor? _____

Name them: _____

d. How do you deal with a frequently used word for which there is no known sign?

e. How do you deal with an infrequently used word for which there is no known sign?

f. Does the school have some sort of policy to develop and incorporate new sign language vocabulary?

Yes____ No____

Please elaborate: _____

g. Do you work with other interpreters in coordinating sign language usage and policies?

Yes____ No____

Please elaborate: _____

h. In the classroom, do you translate word-for-word or do you interpret what is being said?

i. On what basis were you selected to interpret in your classes?

j. Are notetaking services available to the students? Yes____ No____

k. Do you work with a notetaker? Yes____ No____

Describe her(his) duties and how both of your tasks are coordinated:

_____

_____

_____

_____

VI. SUBJECT COMPREHENSION

a. Do you feel that the deaf students understand the subject matter adequately?

Yes____ No____

b. If not, why do you feel that the deaf student does not have adequate comprehension?

_____

_____

_____

_____

VII. INTERPRETER/TEACHER INTERACTION

a. What percentage of your time is devoted to communication with teachers during a school quarter? _____

b. Do teachers make class notes and outlines available to you?

Yes____ No____

c. Are these class notes and/or outlines given to you prior to the beginning of the quarter, or are they given to you as the progresses?

_____

d. Do you work with the teachers in developing and incorporating new sign language vocabulary for each subject area?

Yes____ No____

e. If so, how is this done? _____

_____

_____

_____

f. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with teachers regardless of whether problems do or do not exist?

Yes____ No____

g. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

h. Do you see teachers informally?

Yes____ No_____

i. If so, do you seek the teachers out or do they look for you?

j. For what reasons, generally, do you contact teachers?

k. For what reasons, generally, do teachers contact you?

l. What improvement in interpreter/teacher communication and cooperation would you suggest?

VIII. INTERPRETER/COUNSELOR INTERACTION

a. What percentage of your time is devoted to communicating with counselors during a school quarter? _____

b. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with counselors regardless of whether problems do or do not exist?

c. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

d. Do you see counselors informally?

Yes_____ No_____

e. If so, do you seek the counselors out or do they look for you?

f. For what reasons, generally, do you contact counselors?

g. For what reasons, generally, do counselors contact you?

h. What improvements in interpreter/counselor communication and cooperation would you suggest?

IX. INTERPRETER/ADMINISTRATOR INTERACTION

a. What percentage of your time is devoted to communicating with administrators during a school quarter? _____

b. Is there a formal schedule for meeting with administrators?

Yes_____ No_____

c. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

d. Do you see administrators informally?

Yes _____ No_____

e. If so, do you seek the administrators out or do they contact you?

f. For what reasons, generally, do administrators contact you?

g. For what reasons, generally, do you contact administrators?

h. What improvements would you make in interpreter/administrator communication and cooperation?

X. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

# APPENDIX F

# ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW FORM

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

a. Name of Administrator: _____

b. Name of school: _____

II. EDUCATION

a. Circle the number of years of education the administrator has had.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

b. In what field did you receive your degree(s)?

1. Bachelor _____

2. Master _____

3. Doctorate _____

c. How many years of administrative training have you had? _____

d. How much practicum have you had in educational administration?

_____

e. Where did you acquire your administrative training?

_____

f. Where did you acquire your communication skills (i.e., signing, fingerspelling, etc.)? _____

g. If acquired in a formal program, please describe the program.

_____

_____

_____

III. PREVIOUS EMPLOYMENT

a. Prior to your current employment, what experience, if any, have you had in working with the deaf?

_____

_____

b. How many years of experience have you had in working with the deaf? _____

c. If you have previously held positions in education institutions, please list them.

_____

_____

_____

IV. CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

a. How did you become aware of the availability of your current position?

b. What were the stated requirements, if any, for acquisition of your current employment?

c. What do you see as being the major duties of your current position?

d. What do you consider to be the basic goals of the deaf program?

e. What are your expectations for a graduate from the deaf program?

f. What are your expectations for a non-graduate?

g. What aspects of the progtam have been changed since its inception?

h. What program changes would you like to see in the future?

i. What program changes do you see in the future?

V. STUDENT RECRUITMENT

a. What are the methods by which you make the program known to the public?

b. From what source(s) do you receive information about prospective students?

c. Do you inform agencies and personnel of program opportunitities for the deaf?

Yes _____ No _____

d. If yes, which agencies and personnel do you inform?

e. What procedure is used to inform these agencies and personnel?

f. What do you consider to be the strengths of the referral procedure presently employed?

g. What do you consider to be the weaknesses of the referral procedure presently employed?

h. What changes, if any, would you make in the present referral procedures?

VI. ADMISSIONS

a. Please list the program's admission requirements.

b. How were these requirements arrived at?

c. How do the deaf program's requirements differ from the school's admission requirements?

d. What do you consider to be the strengths of the deaf program's admission requirements?

e. What do you consider to be the weaknesses of the deaf program's requirements?

f. What changes, if any, would you make in the current admission requirements?

VII. STUDENT FINANCIAL SUPPORT

a. What financial support is available to the students in the program?

b. What are the requirements for awarding fianacial support to a student?

VIII. MEDICAL SERVICES

a. What medical services are available to the deaf students in the program?

b. Does the deaf program employ an audiologist? Yes____ No____

c. If so, how frequently is auditory testing conducted?

d. Does the deaf person employ a speech therapist? Yes____ No____

e. If so, how frequently does each student receive speech therapy?

IX. PREPARATORY PROGRAM

a. What are the goals of your preparatory program?

b. How are these goals achieved?

c. What is the duration of the preparatory program?

d. What courses of study are available in the preparatory program?

e. Are all of the above courses mandatory or are some optional?

Mandatory_____ Optional_____

f. Which ones are optional and why?

g. Which ones are mandatory and why?

X. STUDENT PLACEMENT WITHIN THE PROGRAM

a. Do you utilize test scores (i.e., GATB results) in placement of a student within a particular subject area?

Yes____ No____

b. What test measures are utilized to place a student within a subject area?

c. What criteria other than test scores are used to place a student within a subject area?

d. What do you consider to be the strengths of your present placement procedure?

e. What do you consider to be the weaknesses of your present placement procedure?

f. What changes, if any, would you make in the present placement procedure?

XI. COMMUNICATION AND INTERACTION WITH STUDENTS

a. In general, how do you communicate with the students?

speech and speech reading _____ fingerspelling _____

sign language _____ writing _____ gestures _____ interpreter aid _____

other _____

b. What percentage of the deaf students can you communicate with adequately? _____

c. How much of their communication - no matter what form it takes - do you understand?

all of it _____ most of it _____ some of it _____ none of it _____

d. For those students whose communication you do not understand, what means do you employ to understand them?

e. What do you consider to be your strengths in communicating with the deaf?

f. What do you consider to be your weaknesses in communicating with the deaf?

g. What do you consider to be the deaf persons' strengths in communicating with you?

h. What do you consider to be the deaf persons' weaknesses in communicating with you?

i. What percentage of your time per school quarter do you devote to communicating with students?

j. Are appointments with students made on a regular basis or are problems handled as they come up?

k. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with students, regardless of whether problems do or do not exist?

Yes _____ No _____

l. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter?

m. Do you meet with students informally?

Yes _____ No _____

n. If so, do you generally seek the students out or do they look for you?

o. For what reasons, generally, do you contact students?

p. For what reasons, generally, do students contact you?

q. What do you consider to be the strengths of the present administrator/student relationship?

r. What do you consider to be the weaknesses in the present administrator/student relationship?

s. What improvements in the present administrator/student relationship would you suggest?

_____

XII. INTERACTION WITH PARENTS

a. How often do you hold conferences with the parents of students during a school quarter?

frequently _____ occasionally _____ never _____

b. For what reasons, generally, do parents of students desire meeting with you ?

_____

_____

c. For what reasons, generally, do you desire meeting with parents?

_____

_____

d. What form do administrator/parent conferences take the majority of the time?

telephone _____ TTY _____ letter _____ in person _____ other _____

XIII. ADMINISTRATOR/COUNSELOR INTERACTION

a. What percentage of your time per school quarter do you devote to communicating with counselors?

_____

b. Is there a formal schedule for meeting with counselors?

Yes _____ No _____

c. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

_____

_____

d. Do you meet with counselors informally? Yes _____ No _____

e. If so, do you seek the counselors out or do they look for you?

_____

f. For what reasons, generally, do counselors contact you?

_____

_____

g. For what reasons, generally, do you contact counselors?

_____

_____

h. What improvements in the present administrator/counselor relationship would you suggest?

_____

_____

XIV. ADMINISTRATOR/PREPARATORY PROGRAM TEACHER INTERACTION

a. How often do you communicate with the prep-program teachers during a school quarter?

_____

b. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with prep-program teachers, regardless of whether problems do or do not exist?

Yes _____ No _____

c. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

_____

_____

d. Do you meet with prep-program teachers informally?

Yes _____ No _____

e. If so, do you seek the prep-program teachers out or do they look for you?

_____

f. For what reasons, generally, do you contact prep-program teachers?

_____

_____

g. For what reasons, generally, do prep-program teachers contact you?

_____

_____

h. What improvements in the present administrator/prep-program teacher relationship would you suggest?

_____

_____

XV. ADMINISTRATOR/TECHNICAL VOCATIONAL TEACHER INTERACTION

a. How often do you communicate with technical vocational teachers during a school quarter?

_____

b. Is there a formal schedule for meetings with technical vocational teachers, regardless of whether problems do or don't exist?

Yes _____ No _____

c. If so, when are these meetings scheduled during a school quarter and what is generally discussed?

_____

_____

d. Do you meet with technical vocational teachers informally?

Yes _____ No _____

e. If so, do you see the technical vocational teachers out or do they look for you?

_____

f. For what reasons, generally, do you contact technical vocational teachers?

_____

_____

g. For what reasons, generally, do technical vocational teachers contact you?

_____

_____

h. What improvements in the present administrator/technical vocational teacher relationship would you suggest?

_____

_____

i. What percentage of your time do you devote to communicating with prep-program and technical vocational teachers during a school quarter? _____

XVI. ADMINISTRATOR/INTERPRETER INTERACTION

a. What percentage of your time do you devote to communicating with the interpreters during a school quarter? _____

b. Is there a formal schedule for meeting with interpreters during a school quarter, regardles of whether problem do or do not exist?

Yes _____ No _____

c. If so, when are these meetings scheduled and what is generally discussed?

_____

_____

d. Do you meet with interpreters informally?

Yes _____ No _____

e. If so, do you seek out the interpreters or do they look for you ?

_____

f. For what reasons, generally, do you contact interpreters?

g. For what reasons, generally, do interpreters contact you?

h. What improvements in the present administrator/interpreter relationship would you suggest?

XVII. STAFF RECRUITMENT

a. What are your hiring policies for counselors?

b. What are your hiring policies for prep-program teachers?

c. What are your hiring policies for interpreters?

d. What are your hiring policies for notetakers?

e. What are your hiring policies for tutors?

f. If there are other people employed by the program, who are they and what were their hiring requirements?

XVIII. STUDENT PLACEMENT

a. Do you contact prospective employers?

Yes _____ No _____

b. Do prospective employers contact you?

Yes _____ No _____

c. What is the procedure for placement when you contact prospective employers?

_____

_____

_____

d. What is the procedure for placement when prospective employers contact you?

_____

_____

_____

e. How much contact, generally, do you have with a student once he has a job (other than on the job contact?

continual _____ sporadic _____ seldom _____ never _____

XIX. WITHDRAWALS

a. What are the reasons, generally, for the withdrawal of a deaf student from the technical vocational program?

_____

_____

_____

b. How much contact, generally, do you have with a student once he has withdrawn from the program?

continual _____ sporadic _____ seldom _____ never _____

c. Do you refer the student to an agency or rehabilitation counselor once he has decided to withdraw from the program?

Yes _____ No _____

d. What types of agencies and personnel do you contact?

_____

_____

_____

XX. FOLLOW-UP

a. Describe, briefly, the program's follow-up procedures.

b. What improvements would you make in the current follow-up procedures and why?

XXI. DEAF PROGRAM COSTS

a. What is the per pupil cost per school quarter? _____

b. How many pupils per school quarter are accepted into the program? _____

c. How is the year broken up into school quarters?

d. What is the per hour interpreter cost? _____

e. How many interpreters are working in the deaf program? _____

f. On the average, how many hours per quarter does each interpreter work? _____

g. What is the per hour notetaker cost? _____

h. How many notetakers are working in the deaf program? _____

i. How many hours does each notetaker work per quarter? _____

j. How many tutors are employed by the deaf program? _____

k. What is the per hour tutor cost? _____

l. How many hours does each tutor work per quarter? _____

m. What is the annual salary for a program counselor? _____

n. How many program counselors are there? _____

o. What is the annual salary for the program administrator? _____

p. How much is spent per year on secretarial and other support services? _____

q. What are the costs of student medical services? _____

r. What is the annual salary for an audiologist? _____

s. What is the annual salary for a speech therapist? _____

t. If there are other people employed by the program, who are they and what are the annual costs of their services?

_____

_____

XXII. THE PROGRAM WITHIN THE SCHOOL

a. What kinds of things are done to promote student integration within the school?

_____

_____

_____

b. Are all of the school facilities available to the students in the deaf program? Yes _____ No _____

c. If not, what facilities are not available to the students in the deaf program?

_____

_____

d. Are all of the deaf program facilities available to the total school population? Yes _____ No _____

e. If not, what deaf program facilities are not availabe to the total school population?

_____

_____

f. Does the deaf program share support service costs with the school?

Yes _____ No _____

g. If so, what costs are shared?

_____

_____

h. Do the deaf program administrators confer with school administrators?

Yes _____ No _____

i. If so what do they confer about and with whom?

_____

_____

_____

_____

j. Do the deaf program counselors confer with school counselors?

Yes _____ No _____

k. If so, what do the counselors confer about?

_____

_____

_____

l. Do the deaf program teachers confer with school teachers?

Yes _____ NO _____

m. If so, what do they confer about?

_____

_____

_____

XXIII. PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

a. What professional organizations do you belong to?

_____

_____

_____

_____

# APPENDIX G

## Tables: Current Students

Table 21

Why Current Students Would Prefer to Go to School with both Hearing and Deaf Students

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | It is good for deaf people to learn to get along with hearing people. | 1 |
| 2. | Can communicate with both hearing and deaf. | 1 |
| 3. | Hearing can help the deaf improve communication. | 1 |
| 4. | Gives deaf individual more experience with the hearing. | 1 |
| 5. | I have many hearing friends and like to associate with both. | 1 |
| 6. | I want to associate with both, because hearing can help me to learn to communicate. | 1 |
| 7. | More learning with both. | 1 |
| 8. | I want to be able to associate with both deaf and hearing worlds. | 1 |
| 9. | Can learn more things from hearing people - where parties are, etc. | 1 |
| 10. | Hearing can help deaf to bring communication to a higher level. | 1 |
| 11. | I can learn communication from hearing people that will help on the job. | 1 |
| 12. | Hearing people can be associated with and help communication. | 1 |
| 13. | Doesn't know. | 1 |
| 14. | I like to mingle and talk with the hearing students. | 1 |
| 15. | Because communication with hearing and deaf students helps to make friends easier. | 1 |
| 16. | It is good for the deaf to mingle with the hearing, to communicate with each other. | 1 |
| 17. | Helps deaf people to see what hearing people are doing. | 1 |
| 18. | I like to associate with both hearing and deaf. | 1 |
| 19. | I am between both groups; I would like to learn signing from the deaf to understand them better. | 1 |
| 20. | If doing work and not understanding, hearing students can help interpret. | 1 |
| 21. | I can interpret for both deaf and hearing. | 1 |
| 22. | Can learn speech reading from hearing and teach signing to hearing. | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Hearing students can interpret for the deaf. | 1 |
| 2. | I can communicate with both. | 1 |
| 3. | It is better to associate with both groups than deaf alone. I want to relate to all groups. I probably relate better to hearing. I want to be able to associate with both groups. | 1 |

Table 21

Why Current Students Would Prefer to Go to School with both Hearing and Deaf Students, (cont.)

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4. | Because I have to learn to associate with both groups. | 1 |
| 5. | I enjoy being with both - I communicate better with hearing people. | 1 |
| 6. | It's difficult to communicate with hearing, but they can help understand the subject. | 1 |
| 7. | I like to talk to everyone - to communicate with both deaf and hearing. | 1 |
| 8. | I like to communicate with both. I can understand speech if spoken slowly. | 1 |
| 9. | Deaf can learn speech from hearing people, deaf just use signs all the time. | 1 |
| 10. | Hearing people are more intellectually oriented, but don't always understand problems. | 1 |
| 11. | Good communication with hearing students. | 1 |
| 12. | Good to learn more ways to communicate. | 1 |
| 13. | I like to associate with hearing and deaf students. | 1 |
| 14. | It's better to associate with hearing and deaf. | 1 |
| 15. | I learn more; it's a different environment. | 1 |
| 16. | I have to work with both, so I have to get along with both. | 1 |
| 17. | In my job I will have to get along with hearing people. | 1 |
| 18. | Because I can communicate with both. | 1 |
| 19. | I can communicate with both easily. | 1 |
| 20. | It's better to associate with both groups than deaf alone. | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Hearing people help with communication in class. | 2 |
| 2. | Hearing students can help me adjust to being with hearing. | 1 |
| 3. | Hearing people help deaf people to understand in and out of class. | 1 |
| 4. | Hearing people can help communication, yet I can sign with the deaf. | 1 |
| 5. | Deaf and hearing can help each other to communicate. | 1 |
| 6. | Hearing can help deaf communicate. | 1 |
| 7. | Hearing people have experience that helps deaf people in the classroom. | 1 |
| 8. | It doesn't bother me. | 1 |
| 9. | Hearing people help to interpret in class and out of class. | 1 |

Table 22

Why It Makes No Difference to Current Students Whether They Go to School with Hearing, Deaf or both

| | |
|---|---|
| **Delgado** | |
| 1. I can get along with both kinds of people. | 1 |
| 2. I like to mingle and communicate with both deaf and hearing. | 1 |
| **Seattle** | |
| 1. No response. | 3 |
| 2. Deaf and hearing students are all the same. | 1 |
| 3. I can communicate with both easily. | 1 |
| **TVI** | |
| 1. [illegible]ng can help interpret. | 1 |
| 2. Easier to communicate with the deaf. | 1 |
| 3. Hearing people get more information from teachers, you can learn more. | 1 |
| 4. Hearing people have more speech and can help deaf people. | 1 |
| 5. I went to a hearing high school; now TVI is best of both worlds. | 1 |
| 6. Everybody is equal. | 1 |
| 7. I haven't learned sign language yet and sometimes hearing people talk too fast or too slow. | 1 |

Table 23

Why Current Student Would Prefer to Go to School with Deaf Students

| | |
|---|---|
| **Delgado** | |
| 1. It is easier to communicate with deaf students. | 2 |
| 2. I am learning sign language from deaf students. | 1 |
| **Seattle** | |
| 1. It is easier to communicate with deaf students. | 2 |
| 2. It is difficult to communicate with some hearing students. | 1 |
| **TVI** | |
| 1. It is easier to communicate with deaf people. | 1 |
| 2. Too difficult to communicate with hearing people. | 1 |
| 3. I feel more confident with the deaf. | 1 |
| 4. I get along with deaf people; it's easier to communicate. | 1 |

Table 24

Why Current Students Like the Idea of a Vocational and Technical School for Young Deaf People Who do not go to a School such as Gallaudet

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Not sure/don't know | 9 |
| 2. | Delgado College will provide good training for jobs other than teaching. | 1 |
| 3. | Delgado helps you to get a job. Gallaudet was too frustrating with all the different subjects. | 1 |
| 4. | Not sure - there is too much emphasis on trades and not enough on college training. | 1 |
| 5. | Yes - but drafting program at Delgado is too small. | 1 |
| 6. | Deaf need to learn more vocational than academic training. | 1 |
| 7. | Delgado gives better training for jobs. | 1 |
| 8. | Yes, but I could not take courses I wanted; staff would not let me take desired courses. | 1 |
| 9. | Deaf people can learn more; gives training for jobs. | 1 |
| 10. | Program is good, but director is not for the deaf. | 1 |
| 11. | Gallaudet takes four years and is for teachers. | 1 |
| 12. | Delgado trains people for jobs. | 1 |
| 13. | Because I think Delgado is a good school but I think Gallaudet is the best and has a better program. | 1 |
| 14. | Young deaf people can learn as much at Delgado even if they did not go to Gallaudet. | 1 |
| 15. | Delgado helps prepare deaf people for the hearing business world. | 1 |
| 16. | It has the kind of training I want; Gallaudet is for teachers. | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Program has good training for jobs. | 3 |
| 2. | Gives good training for jobs - you can learn more. | 1 |
| 3. | There is lots of help for deaf students; interpreters can help the students. | 1 |
| 4. | Teachers are helping to learn skills; interpreters help in class; teachers cooperate with students. | 1 |
| 5. | Helps deaf people to get degrees or certificates and provides training to get jobs. | 1 |
| 6. | It is a means of acquiring education that might not be available in any other way. | 1 |
| 7. | Because it helps you to get a job more easily. | 1 |
| 8. | It provides training for hard of hearing individuals who have no place else to go. | 1 |
| 9. | Program has good training in cosmetology. | 1 |

Table 24

Why Current Students Like the Idea of a Vocational and Technical Schools for Young Deaf People Who do not go to a School such as Gallaudet, (cont.)

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 10. | It gives people chances at training for jobs if their grades are too low to get into Gallaudet. | 1 |
| 11. | The program gives good training for jobs. Gallaudet is for people who have good English skills. | 1 |
| 12. | Good program here--good teachers help any student have interpreters. | 1 |
| 13. | To learn basics for entering another college. | 1 |
| 14. | It is better here for people who can't afford four years of college. | 1 |
| 15. | Get more experience with hearing people -- make friends. | 1 |
| 16. | But it is hard to find credits that are acceptable for college transfer. | 1 |
| 17. | Staff is willing to help you out - staff keeps eyes open for job possibilities. | 1 |
| 18. | Some students are good with machines, etc. and are not good in an academic program. It's good idea; happier in what they do best. | 1 |
| 19. | Provides good training for jobs; it keeps the student busy and off welfare. | 1 |
| 20. | Gives good training for the future and gives student a chance to find a job when he graduates. | 1 |
| 21. | It's "hands-on work" that deaf people can do well - gives good training for jobs. | 1 |
| 22. | Program provides more training and experience so student can get a job. | 1 |
| 23. | I have seen too many people go to college and not get a job - program provides training for jobs. | 1 |
| 24. | Program has different courses for different jobs; Gallaudet is for people who want to be teachers. | 1 |
| 25. | Not sure | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Not sure | 7 |
| 2. | Gallaudet is for people who want to be teachers. TVI provides training for an occupation. | 1 |
| 3. | TVI gives better training for the technical-vocational fields. | 1 |
| 4. | Gallaudet trains teachers. TVI provides training in printing. | 1 |
| 5. | Gallaudet trains teachers. Does not offer courses in printing, etc. | 1 |
| 6. | Gallaudet is for people who want to be teachers. Gallaudet doesn't provide training TVI does. | 1 |

Table 24

Why Current Students Like the Idea of a Vocational and Technical Institute for Young Deaf People Who do not go to a School such as Gallaudet, (cont.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| TVI | | |
| 7. | I can learn more here; Gallaudet is for people who want to be teachers. | 1 |
| 8. | Gallaudet trains teachers--there is no market for teachers. TVI gives training for available jobs. | 1 |
| 9. | Gallaudet is a good place for an education, but TVI is a good place to get a job. | 1 |
| 10. | At TVI you learn more faster than you do at Gallaudet College. | 1 |
| 11. | TVI provides training on machinery. | 1 |
| 12. | Gallaudet is for teachers. TVI gives better training in practical jobs. | 1 |
| 13. | But it depends on the individual if it is a good idea or not. | 1 |
| 14. | It is a good alternative for people who don't want to go to college. | 1 |
| 15. | Training at TVI is faster than at Gallaudet; you can get a job faster. | 1 |

Table 25

Reasons for Current Student Dissatisfaction with Training

Delgado

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Delgado doesn't have the type of electrical training needed. There are not enough interpreters. | 1 |
| 2. | The staff would not let me take the courses I want. | 1 |
| 3. | Machinery used too old. | 1 |
| 4. | Interpreting is not good enough. | 1 |

Seattle

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Problems in relating to teachers and students. Training is satisfactory. Notetakers have helped. | 1 |
| 2. | I can't understand the interpreter most of the time. It makes me tired to keep my eyes on instructor and interpreter. | 1 |
| 3. | Sometimes interpreters don't move their mouths while interpreting, I know sign language but often can't keep up -- depends on lipreading. Tutors are helpful, but not available enough of the time. | 1 |
| 4. | Hearing people on the deaf program staff have a lack of understanding of deaf people and don't keep their word -- don't spread gossip or personal problems of deaf students. Lack of understanding among the interpreters. | 1 |
| 5. | Yes and No -- Sometimes teacher does not interpreter enough what he is saying; sometimes he is not patient enough. | 1 |

TVI

0

Table 26

Kind of Work Students will Look for When They Leave the School

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | doesn't know | 10 |
| 2. | cabinet making/carpentry | 3 |
| 3. | cooking | 1 |
| 4. | key punch or letter sorting machine | 1 |
| 5. | computer programming | 1 |
| 6. | commercial art | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | clerk typist | 3 |
| 2. | welder | 2 |
| 3. | carpentry/marine carpentry | 2 |
| 4. | baking | 1 |
| 5. | teacher's aide | 1 |
| 6. | horology | 1 |
| 7. | head teacher in poverty program preschool setting | 1 |
| 8. | cosmetology | 1 |
| 9. | photography | 1 |
| 10. | library work | 1 |
| 11. | office work | 1 |
| 12. | drafting | 1 |
| 13. | graphic arts | 1 |
| 14. | chemistry lab technician | 1 |
| 15. | trailer building | 1 |
| 16. | diesel mechanic | 1 |

TV

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | general office practice | 7 |
| 2. | tool and die making | 3 |
| 3. | undecided | 2 |
| 4. | electro-mechanical service work | 2 |
| 5. | packaging | 1 |
| 6. | farming or printing | 1 |
| 7. | printing | 1 |
| 8. | sheet metal | 1 |
| 9. | not sure | 1 |

Table 27

Description of the Summer or Part Time Job Students Have Had

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | stock boy | 3 |
| 2. | assistant secretary to principal of school for the deaf | 1 |
| 3. | draftsman | 1 |
| 4. | construction (full-time) | 1 |
| 5. | counselor to deaf children at summer camp | 1 |
| 6. | photography | 1 |
| 7. | machine maintenance (cleaning, oiling, etc.) | 1 |
| 8. | furniture moving | 1 |
| 9. | usher at drive-in movie | 1 |
| 10. | dishwasher | 1 |
| 11. | air freight | 1 |
| 12. | worked in drug store | 1 |
| 13. | repaired airplane frames | 1 |
| 14. | boxing merchandise in shirt manufacturing company | 1 |
| 15. | printing | 1 |
| 16. | social security worker | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | dishwashing | 4 |
| 2. | janitorial work | 4 |
| 3. | clerical work | 3 |
| 4. | work in a cannery | 2 |
| 5. | landscape artist | 2 |
| 6. | assembly | 2 |
| 7. | baking | 1 |
| 8. | cabinet maker | 1 |
| 9. | machine operator | 1 |
| 10. | molded/graded plastic | 1 |
| 11. | book collector in hospital print shop & power sewing machine operator | 1 |
| 12. | farm work | 1 |
| 13. | offset printing | 1 |
| 14. | city park laborer | 1 |
| 15. | folding/counting boxes | 1 |
| 16. | secretarial assistant | 1 |
| 17. | cook | 1 |
| 18. | tutor for deaf/supervisor for deaf | 1 |
| 19. | gas station attendent | 1 |
| 20. | making fiberglass boats | 1 |
| 21. | sectioned tires/cut post holes | 1 |
| 22. | lumber pile training job | 1 |
| 23. | repair trucks | 1 |

Table 27

Description of the Summer or Part Time Job Students Have Had

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | custodial work | 3 |
| 2. | printing | 2 |
| 3. | waitress | 2 |
| 4. | cleaned teacher's rooms | 1 |
| 5. | farming | 1 |
| 6. | junkyard work | 1 |
| 7. | automotive repair (full time) | 1 |
| 8. | general office practice | 1 |
| 9. | factory work | 1 |
| 10. | computer coding | 1 |
| 11. | camp counselor | 1 |
| 12. | photography developer | 1 |

APPENDIX H

Tables: Preparatory Program Teachers

Table 28

Improvements in the Preparatory Program Preparatory Teachers Would Make

Delgado:

1) The program should be restructured and from that point, then recommendations could be made.

2) Need for low-level training program for deaf to assist those incapable of entering curriculum; need selective training.

3) No response.

Seattle:

1) At least two more prep teachers if program expands and teacher aides.

2) More materials for math related to particular subject areas. Improve the job sampling--some kind of test that will make up for what the job sampling can't reveal as far as students' knowledge of a particular job choice. Hopefully, in the future, the prep program will become so flexible as to adjust each subject to each student's particular need. Each student should be able to progress at his own pace, but not just left to his own resources--actually a one-to-one teaching situation. Must still have an instructor teaching.

3) Better organization and definitions of the curriculum. Definite plans now to work a curriculum.

TVI:

1) Give student more vocational exploration.

2) More vocational exploration--more "hands on" experience before going into a major area.

3) If money were available, add an evaluation center; i.e., "hands on" experience center for short term projects so the student can get a taste of the major, supervised and evaluated by someone in the deaf program (whom they don't have right now)

Table 29

Additional Comments

Delgado:

1) The program administration: a) does not encourage (in fact, some to discourage) professional improvement (go to graduate classes, etc.); b) fosters constant discord among staff members rather than encouraging teamwork; c) etc.

2) None

3) No response.

Seattle:

1) It is my studied opinion, based on four years of actual classroom contacts, personal observations and experience that a strong preparatory program is essential to reasonable success in a program of this kind at the junior college level for the deaf students. I enjoyed this interview and I hope my answers will be beneficial to this important research project.

2) None.

3) None.

TVI:

1) The reason I mentioned Ameslan in some of the answers is I think it is very important to speak the students' language--the language they understand the best.

2) Too much subjective material in this questionnaire.

3) How will you measure these subjective questions?

APPENDIX I

Tables: Counselors

Table 30

Counselors' Descriptions of Weaknesses in Present Referral Procedures

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Delgado: | 1. | Sort of hit and miss, nothing real positive--no trouble in getting the word spread |
| | 2. | Students should not have to meet the requirements of Vocational Rehabilitation; contradiction to post-secondary opportunities because others do not have to come through Vocational Rehabilitation. I'm opposed to labeling. Vocational Rehabilitation should be thought of as a consumer source for service and money |
| Seattle: | 1. | Many people may look upon Seattle Community College as a "dumping place' for people who can't go to Gallaudet; people don't realize the worth of the program here; shortage of staff--can't get enough information out about the program to clarify what the program is about; not able to handle the numbers of students who apply nor those who are qualified--the basis of the shortage is lack of funding |
| | 2. | Not enough involvement in referral procedures to know the weaknesses |
| | 3. | I don't know |
| TVI: | 1. | Collection of all data on students and getting it together systematically is difficult and time-consuming--this is needed to make an admissions decision |
| | 2. | Written information regarding referrals is now strong--we need a better written description of the program. |

Table 31

Suggested Improvements in the Counselor/Administrator Relationship

Delgado:
1. Administrators should leave the counseling to the counselors.
2. Satisfied now. If students are attending classes, counselors appear to be doing their jobs.
3. The basic problem is the inability to allow the staff to function with a professional independence. This would mean that you would have to recognize that all of your staff is competent to handle their own duties. This philosophy must change. Personalities are not separated from the functions; e.g., if you talk about counseling services, it turns into personal accusations--this is how things are handled here. Administrators feel that when others make recommendations for change, they are challenging the competency of the administration rather than helping to change the program. The approach is too authoritarian. Things are done by the administrators regardless of how the staff and students feel about it. The triology [adminstrators] gottogether and wiped out the students. There is no purpose or dignity to counseling and the counseling relationship when someone comes along and intervenes. Counselors should give information to administrators that should lead to change. If the students are dissatisfied, making poor adjustment--indicating changes are needed--this information should be transmitted.

Seattle:
1. Greater contact is needed (it is difficult to get together because of each person's schedule). I don't feel that I know everything that is going on--I'm often told at the last minute about things.
2. More communication, possible reinstatement of formal meetings. More openness, more trust established.
3. None.

TVI:
1. None.
2. None.

Table 32

Counselors' Descriptions of Placement Procedures

Delgado:
1. When the counselors contacts the employer, a "call for help" is sent out. The employer is notified of a student who is qualified and going into the community. College and local placement services also help. When the employer contacts the counselor, an appointment is set up with the employer if the student is qualified. The student and the employer are asked if some one should accompany the student.
2. [This counselor did not contact employers] The employer usually asks for a reference for a particular student.
3. [This counselor did not contact employers] [illegible] I tell the student to speak to the employer on their own--this is usually for [illegible]

[illegible]
1. I speal to the supervisor in person before the actual interview. I give him background on deafness and the student in mind. Then I send the student on his own because I want students to present themselves as being able to function on their own. Technical/vocational instructors are the main people who inform counselors about placement opportunities.
2. Precipitated by looking for a particular job for a particular student (checking a place-out or getting a recommendation from a vocational instructor). Job development--looking at larger companies to sell them on the idea of hiring deaf people.
3. I arrange an interview between employer and student. I provide interpreting service if it is needed for both the interview and on-the-job situations. On-the-job orientation is also given.

TVI:
1. I contact the employer and explain to them the kind of student and training we are talking about. I ask if the student can come over for an interview, and the student and counselor go for the interview. If the student is hired, the interpreter goes with the student on his first day of the job. If there is repeated contact with a company, students are sent over with just an interpreter.
2. I may learn about a job through the newspaper. I call the employer and ask if they are interested in hiring a particular student. The student and the counselor go for the interview, and the counselor interprets. The employer is told that an interpreter will be available for up to one week and that, if they wish, the student will work one day without pay to prove himself.

[The procedures outlined by the Seattle and TVI counselors are generally the same whether contact is initiated by the counselor or the employer]

Table 33

Suggested Ways to Improve Employer/Employee Relationships

Delgado:
1. It is more important that the client is prepared in school for independence on the job.
2. Counseling service of the program be provided with time to visit and contact empoyers.
3. No response.

Seattle:
1. Communication channels might be provided if requested and needed, but it is important for the employer and employee to develop their own relationships.
2. Structured follow-up for meetings with employer (sometimes the program offers an interpreter for the first week of employment to facilitate entry into the job).
3. Knowing someone cares. The person who has helped contact the employer for deaf employee placement should follow-up (there is a relationship there). The problem is uptightness on the part of the employer in having someone check up on them and the deaf employee. But there must be some kind of communication for exchange of knowledge and discussion of problems.

TVI:
1. If there were more time for the counselor himself to go into the community for continual contact with employers, since the counselor knows more about the student.
2. If there could be a more concerted effort to help the student upgrade (more training possibly).

Table 34

Additional Comments

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Delgado: | 1. | None. |
| | 2. | None. |
| | 3. | Add members to the staff of the program. Include students in the decision-making process of the program and have greater staff/student interaction (informal). |
| Seattle: | 1. | I would like to see improvement in general communication in the program between all phases of the program. I would like a better relationship with the administrator; I feel open and honest, but they've come back as inadequacies. The administrator feels competitive with the counselors. |
| | 2. | We should develop a job-hunting package (work up a resume, how to go through an interviewing process, what agencies to check on when looking for a job, recommendations, portfolio, etc. We should use someone to do job placement development. We should use someone to develop media and tutorial materials. We should have a person to be responsible for classroom follow-up; you can't always get out there as often as you should. And funding is a problem--you can't implement new ideas for students without money. |
| | 3. | No response. |
| TVI: | 1. | None. |
| | 2. | There is a great need for personal interaction between staffs of deaf programs. I would be helpful to communicate with line staff. |

APPENDIX J

Tables: Teachers

Table 35

Subjects Taught by Technical-Vocational Teachers Interviewed

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | English | 4 |
| 2. | Physics | 2 |
| 3. | Chemistry | 2 |
| 4. | Business Mathematics, Business Communication | 2 |
| 5. | Mathematics | 2 |
| 6. | Architectural Engineering | 3 |
| 7. | Composition-course | 2 |
| 8. | Electrical engineering | 1 |
| 9. | Industrial Relations | 1 |
| 10. | Library Fundamentals | 1 |
| 11. | Keypunch-Data Processing | 1 |
| 12. | Accounting, personal finance, business mathematics | 1 |
| 13. | Orthotics and Prosthetics | 1 |
| 14. | Business Law I and II and Basic Business Finance | 1 |
| 15. | Anatomy | 1 |
| 16. | Material and Processes | 1 |
| 17. | Accounting I and II | 1 |
| 18. | Psychology | 1 |
| 19. | Drafting | 1 |
| 20. | Photography | 1 |
| 21. | Basic Drawing | 1 |
| 22. | Economics | 1 |
| 23. | Introduction to Lettering | 1 |
| 24. | Engineering, Graphics, Civic Engineer | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Accounting | 3 |
| 2. | Welding | 3 |
| 3. | Secretarial Sciences | 2 |
| 4. | Retail Bakery Sales | 2 |
| 5. | Business and Commerce | 2 |
| 6. | Business Education | 1 |
| 7. | Chemistry | 1 |
| 8. | Power Machine Sewing-Design and Consultant | 1 |
| 9. | Technical Drawing | 1 |
| 10. | Data Processing | 1 |
| 11. | Literature I & II, Composition II, IV | 1 |
| 12 | Psychology | 1 |
| 13. | Mathematics, Physics, Apprentice | 1 |
| 14. | Communication Skills, Technical Writing | 1 |
| 15. | Business Finance | 1 |
| 16. | Introduction to Child Development, Philosophy of Parents Education | 1 |
| 17. | Mathematics | 1 |
| 18. | Biology and Anatomy and Physics | 1 |
| 19. | Shorthand, Typing, Machine Transcription, Business English | 1 |
| 20. | Filing | 1 |

Subjects Taught by Technical-Vocational Teachers (cont.)

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Accounting | 2 |
| 2. | Related Drawing | 2 |
| 3. | Machine Tool Processes | 2 |
| 4. | Metallurgy and Physics | 2 |
| 5. | Communication and Human Relations | 1 |
| 6. | Welding | 1 |
| 7. | Medical Secretary, General Office Practice, Related Business | 1 |
| 8. | Media Director - Photography | 1 |
| 9. | Horology | 1 |
| 10. | Hotel and Restaurant Cookery | 1 |
| 11. | General Office Practice | 1 |
| 12. | Press work | 1 |
| 13. | Keypunch | 1 |
| 14. | Secretarial | 1 |
| 15. | Sheet Metal | 1 |
| 16. | Commercial Arts | 1 |
| 17. | Cosmetology | 1 |
| 18. | SLBP (Reading, Math, and Language Arts) | 1 |
| 19. | Business Mathematics and Machines | 1 |
| 20. | Carpentry | 1 |
| 21. | Composition | 1 |
| 22. | Cabinet Making | 1 |

Table 36

If Teacher Slows Down Teaching Pace for the Benefit of the Deaf Students How the Others React

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | not that noticeable | 1 |
| 2. | patiently, seem to understand, curious, never hostile | 1 |
| 3. | they like it - many are slow learners | 1 |
| 4. | they don't know the difference - fine with them | 1 |
| 5. | other students try to help - get along fine | 1 |
| 6. | they don't verbally react - they get restless though | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | no reaction-no change in attitude | 1 |
| 2. | they need it, too-no problem | 1 |
| 3. | at initial class meeting inquire about deaf students; asks for students note takers - no adverse reaction from others | 1 |
| 4. | doesn't seem to bother others | 1 |
| 5. | no problem | 1 |
| 6. | don't resent it | 1 |
| 7. | no negative or positive reaction | 1 |
| 8. | good, but retards the progress of the faster students - Can't sense any adverse reactions | 1 |
| 9. | Usually begin the class and get the others started: then come back to the deaf student; many deaf students come in with insufficient backround | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | no problem | 1 |
| 2. | explains once to everyone and personally deals with the deaf students to see if they understood | 1 |
| 3. | in one case, one student reacted badly - it is disruptive - hearing students are impatient | 1 |
| 4. | don't mind at all - other students are given extra assignments | 1 |
| 5. | doesn't matter because I teach the deaf separately | 1 |
| 6. | very well | 1 |
| 7. | very favorably | 1 |
| 8. | seem fairly patient - sometimes the rest of the students need slowing down too | 1 |
| 9. | some of the hearing students might appreciate the slowing down process too | 1 |
| 10. | 100% cooperation | |
| 11. | no comments - try to make it up in other ways for the hearing students | 1 |
| 12. | a few times it seemed to irritate hearing students | 1 |
| 13. | doesn't affect hearing because I teach on an individual basis | 1 |

Table 37

What Teacher Considers to be the Strengths of Teaching an Integrated Class

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | None | 6 |
| 2. | Gives ordinary student an appreciation of handicaps that are a part of daily living | 1 |
| 3. | Deaf have opportunity to associate with hearing-some satisfaction for the deaf | 1 |
| 4. | Good experience for teachers and hearing students to be more aware of deaf - puts non-hearing student at ease in another environment | 1 |
| 5. | Thinks about it as a normal class | 1 |
| 6. | Deaf benefit from having same kind of education as hearing - good for deaf personality, socialization, etc. - good for hearing understanding | 1 |
| 7. | Deaf operate in a hearing world - in a normal situation and hopefully social situations | 1 |
| 8. | Deaf pay more attention and get better grades overall than other students | 1 |
| 9. | Deaf gain confidence about how they can function - provided understanding among hearing students | 1 |
| 10. | An advantage for the deaf - placed in a situation similar to future work - loss of hearing is an advantage - don't get carried away in small talk | 1 |
| 11. | Students can learn more if integrated - if they can communicate | 1 |
| 12. | More demanding on teacher, so teacher concentrates on getting message across - uses more illustrations | 1 |
| 13. | Hopefully hearing will better accept deaf students - also deaf will feel more at ease in the situation | 1 |
| 14. | None for teachers, but advantageous for the deaf students | 1 |
| 15. | Hearing environment is good for deaf - tries to involve deaf in social situations with hearing students | 1 |
| 16. | Builds deaf student's confidence - interest of hearing student and teacher in deaf and their program | 1 |
| 17. | For self learning to deal with handicapped people | 1 |
| 18. | Shows deaf they are like anyone else-they can make it their own way in this world | 1 |
| 19. | Makes hearing students and self difficulties aware of deaf students | 1 |
| 20. | Interaction between deaf and hearing students | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | None | 11 |
| 2. | If they want to learn, we're happy to help them. When a deaf student gets a job, there are good reports about the school. | 1 |
| 3. | For self - I feel I am doing something worth-while; noted curiousity and interest of hearing student in the deaf and their problems. | 1 |
| 4. | Deaf are not bothered by noises in machines room or distracted by co-workers. | 1 |
| 5. | Deaf student learns from hearing student, especially in laboratory; learns from watching others. | 1 |
| 6. | Deaf are more interested and try harder; deaf seem to be more motivated. | 1 |
| 7. | Makes the hearing students more compassionate and thoughtful. | 1 |
| 8. | None - I think it would be better if the classes were separate. | 1 |

Table 37

What Teacher Considers to be the Strengths of Teaching an Integrated Class, (cont.)

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9. | Learn from each other; hearing get a better understanding of deaf; deaf can take advantage of opportunities available to others. | 1 |
| 10. | Gives deaf a real life situation rather than setting them apart - should be treated the same. | 1 |
| 11. | Brings about greater understanding of the material; when deaf want something to be rephrased, this also helps others - also a real challenge to teacher in terms of humor, etc. | 1 |
| 12. | Forces deaf to see what hearing students can do and what to expect in the future. | 1 |
| 13. | Deaf can benefit from chalkboard work. | 1 |
| 14. | Deaf will have to work with hearing people so give them some practice here; essential to learn how to communicate with people who don't know sign language. | 1 |
| 15. | Deaf students have spoken to the class and explained what it's like; good to be integrated with hearing students. | 1 |
| 16. | Classroom situation is related more to the real world; more advantageous for hearing students to become familiar with problems of deafness than vice versa. | 1 |
| 17. | Deaf can evaluate their own performance with hearing students' performance; gives the deaf a goal to work for. | 1 |
| 18. | Helps deaf students prepare themselves for industry; deaf students treated the same as other students. | 1 |
| 19. | Breaks down the barrier between deaf and hearing. | 1 |
| 20. | Teacher doesn't take anything for granted as far as students' understanding is concerned-more preparation for classes | 1 |
| 21. | None for the teacher or the student | 1 |
| 22. | For the teacher, an appreciation of good objectives and teaching techniques; hearing students then will benefit from the instruction even more; a lot of students are learning sign language | 1 |
| 23. | Allows other people to see what the deaf are capable of doing-sort of as inspiration | 1 |
| 24. | Good for the deaf to face reality - classes made up of only deaf students are more protected - good for others to realize what the deaf have to face | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Social awareness brought to hearing students by presence of deaf students | 1 |
| 2. | Having deaf students learn to communicate with hearing students | 1 |
| 3. | Brings maturity to entire class | 1 |
| 4. | Hearing students get an appreciation of deaf student's problems. | 1 |
| 5. | Puts deaf student at ease because they become part of a whole. | 1 |
| 6. | Motivation is greater for teacher and hearing students get benefits of this | 1 |
| 7. | None | 1 |
| 8. | Gives teacher a feeling of accomplishment | 1 |
| 9. | Advantageous for deaf student to work among hearing and vice versa | 1 |
| 10. | Teaches responsibility to both deaf and hearing students | 1 |

Table 37

What Teacher Considers to be the Strengths of Teaching an Integrated Class, (cont.)

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 11. | Awareness - makes hearing student more aware of other means of communicating | 1 |
| 12. | Facilitates clearer communication in the class - room for both hearing and deaf students; having both associate is a definite plus for both | 1 |
| 13. | Found himself simplifying instruction, thereby finding more intermediate levels and not taking information for granted. | 1 |
| 14. | Interest and desire to be there on the part of the deaf students - wonderful personalities as student and people on part of deaf students | 1 |
| 15. | Eliminates hypothesis that deaf can't get along. Deaf are competing and can do better than hearing students. | 1 |
| 16. | Greatest strength is for deaf student esteem - when you segregate deaf people, you reinforce the consciousness of his handicap | 1 |
| 17. | Deaf student considers himself one of a group-helps him to obtain more contact with hearing than in real life. | 1 |
| 18. | Both seem to benefit from it; hearing students seem to learn from the interpreters; deaf students like hearing's attention | 1 |
| 19. | Emphasize details more thoroughly to be sure they understand it; drive home part and associate of part with part itself - emphasis on explanation and demonstration | 1 |
| 20. | Tremendous opportunities for people who don't have limitations; the experience is broadening it gives you insight when you can get to know deaf people you can help them and not feel that they're foreign | 1 |
| 21. | Personal feeling of teacher-nice to be able to help deaf people; class helps them | 1 |
| 22. | It's the way the world is - environment is close to what deaf student will find in outside world | 1 |
| 23. | Become more aware of reality-hearing take too many things for granted; it is a challenge and frustrating too | 1 |
| 24. | Deaf and hearing together work out really well - no problem because interpreter is go-between | 1 |
| 25. | An experience in understanding and seeing what can be done for a handicap of this type for hearing student. | 1 |

Table 38

What Teacher Considers to be the weaknesses of teaching an integrated class

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | None | 7 |
| 2. | Hearing students pay more attention to interpreter than lecture | 1 |
| 3. | Great deal of dependence on interpreter | 1 |
| 4. | I don't know what interpreter is saying - I can't communicate directly | 1 |
| 5. | Must repeat if interpreter is here | 1 |
| 6. | Deaf student is weak in written language, poor high school background | 1 |
| 7. | Communication | 1 |
| 8. | Deaf student headstrong-resents authority, but if convinced of proper way he will follow along - insufficient previous training - written tests much poorer than practical aspects of the course | 1 |
| 9. | Finding a job for the deaf where the employer and co-workers accept the student | 1 |
| 10. | Sometimes takes longer to communicate but if the ability is there it will come out | 1 |
| 11. | None except when interpreter is late or can't come | 1 |
| 12. | Ability of interpreter to communicate special terminology | 1 |
| 13. | Dropouts throughout the session - motivation, attitude, poor background of deaf kids - poor initial placement | 1 |
| 14. | Times when things are hard to explain - if using synonyms, when interpreter is present and not present, not sure of understanding | 1 |
| 15. | Making sure interpreter gets meaning across | 1 |
| 16. | Not able to discuss how much deaf understand - on higher levels, slowing down the pace | 1 |
| 17. | Deaf have problem with English language because of sign language, need more help with grammar - class is often beyond them | 1 |
| 18. | If interpreter doesn't understand subject matter - have had this happen twice; interpreter must have background in subject area and must make sure student understands | 1 |
| 19. | Interpreter may not be able to interpret word for word | 1 |
| 20. | Never know if they're reading the assignments-communication problem | 1 |
| 21. | Interpreter must know the subject matter | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | None | 1 |
| 2. | Can't just ask them if they appear not to understand; must go through the interpreter. Makes for a little inhibition on both parts. | 1 |
| 3. | Communication - deaf student (majority) can't read to an acceptable level | 1 |
| 4. | Feels many times like he is not getting across | 1 |
| 5. | Written English - hard to take time in class to work with the deaf student alone | 1 |
| 6. | When on field trips, the deaf student may not be able to communicate and not go | 1 |
| 7. | Go over some of the materials more than once, sometimes | 1 |
| 8. | None unless get a weak interpreter | 1 |
| 9. | Has to take extra time to go back and help the deaf - move as fast as possible but could move faster sometimes | 1 |

What Teacher Considers to be the Weaknesses of Teaching an Integrated Class (cont.)

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 10. | Lack of communication skills on teacher's part | 1 |
| 11. | Speed of class and vocabulary | 1 |
| 12. | Success with totally deaf more so than the hard of hearing - hard of hearing seem to use (deafness) as a crutch | 1 |
| 13. | So much material to cover - deaf students slow things down; have to be careful not to let the deaf hold up the entire class | 1 |
| 14. | Have to go too fast for deaf student and too slow for hearing students in order to accomplish what is necessary for the deaf; sometimes some people get "cheated" if they have to wait on others | 1 |
| 15. | Doesn't know sign language - sometimes interpreter can't translate to the student exactly what the teacher means, especially technical points | 1 |
| 16. | Communication - language - does the deaf have sufficient language to understand the subject matter - if not, virtually impossible to teach him | 1 |
| 17. | Learning pace of deaf student is not equal to that of hearing student | 1 |
| 18. | Vocabulary background - can't pick up daily conversation which is how many things are learned | 1 |
| 19. | Deaf miss out on communication of other students - had experience with deaf who have been very self-centered | 1 |
| 20. | Deaf miss great deal of interaction in class - less input than others - get treated more gently in evaluation by the teacher - but teacher doesn't compromise what is considered adequate | 1 |
| 21. | The deaf student's way of communication - their drawings require more checking because of their communication disadvantage | 1 |
| 22. | Teacher's inability to understand signs - lack of time; tendency to forget about some of their weaknesses and special needs. When taking examination, verbal instruction not given; must interpret written language. Deaf student less prone to ask for extra explanation. | 1 |
| 23. | Mentality of some of the deaf - not ready for material - need more background; can reach only a certain point of efficiency - depends on the student | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | None | 3 |
| 2. | Vocabulary and spelling of deaf student is weak; some students have been babied at home | 1 |
| 3. | The only problem is when a student isn't cut out for the area - there aren't any major problems | 1 |
| 4. | You can only work with one deaf person at a time. If you have the interpreter who knows the subject matter, you're ok. | 1 |
| 5. | Lack of vocabulary in the deaf and no signs for specific vocabulary | 1 |
| 6. | Lack of communication makes deaf student slower | 1 |
| 7. | Hard to tell whether deaf students understand until they get on machine; at that time you have to be available to show that person how to use it; deaf kids will go ahead and sometimes get into dangerous situations without asking questions | 1 |

What Teacher Considers to be Weaknesses of Teaching an Integrated Class, (cont.)

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8. | If too many (more than 3) deaf students with a large hearing groups; if one falls behind other deaf students try to help and fall behind themselves; minor problem - hearing students pay attention to interpreter | 1 |
| 9. | Vocabulary - much deeper problem because deaf do not have the analogy facility this is being partially solved by the prep program | 1 |
| 10. | Sometimes must go a little slower; might have to redefine terms used in drawing. | 1 |
| 11. | Inability to understand written material - vocabulary. | 1 |
| 12. | When you have really sharp students in class and have to slow down for benefit of deaf. | 1 |
| 13. | Deaf student can take up more of your time - may start on assignment and go in wrong direction, have a difficult time turning them around because of frustration | 1 |
| 14. | Verbal communication, reading, vocabulary, pace is affected. | 1 |
| 15. | None; but weakness on teacher's part because she is repeating herself constantly. | 1 |
| 16. | Catering to deaf students, not treating them as equals. | 1 |
| 17. | Deaf students slow down class-varied back-grounds to deaf students. | 1 |
| 18. | Harder to conduct class; more preparation necessary. | 1 |
| 19. | Communication | 1 |
| 20. | If interpreter's unfamiliar with subject, it slows things down. | 1 |
| 21. | Reiterating materials--retracing. | 1 |
| 22. | Have to teach class at pace of hearing students, perhaps too fast for deaf students. | 1 |
| 23. | Deaf students require more time; difficult to be aware of what the deaf student knows or doesn't know. | 1 |

Table 39

Improvements in the Classroom Situation Teacher Would Suggest

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | None | 3 |
| 2. | Added interpreter time in classroom | 2 |
| 3. | Ideal if students and faculty knew sign language | 1 |
| 4. | Trying to get more interaction among deaf and hearing students and teachers - improved interpretation of class discussion | 1 |
| 5. | More teachers should become familiar with deaf and learn communication skills; active communication between instructors and deaf students; more interpreters for the program; more emphasis placed on reading skills and written language in prep program and in the high schools; I feel that some older instructors are reluctant to spend the extra time necessary with the deaf | 1 |
| 6. | An orientation for the instructors in problems and psychology of the deaf | 1 |
| 7. | Instruction in note taking skills for deaf students | 1 |
| 8. | Teachers should be more acquainted with certain problems student may have at home | 1 |
| 9. | All interpreters use exact English | 1 |
| 10. | More visual aids - deaf have a communication problem - can't have interpreter all the time; some way to insure deaf are reading course assignments | 1 |
| 11. | Interpreter must be interested in subject; closer to the real life situation the better | 1 |
| 12. | Special vocabulary for interpreter for each field | 1 |
| 13. | More interpreters with engineering background - better high school preparatory for all students | 1 |
| 14. | Interpreter present all the time | 1 |
| 15. | Deaf student must ask more questions to assume understanding | 1 |
| 16. | More deaf participation - especially speaking | 1 |
| 17. | More interpreters for the school although I feel I have enough | 1 |
| 18. | More visual aids - for orientation, cards explaining basic techniques, instructors learn some sign language before the classes begin | 1 |
| 19. | More awareness on the teacher's part of the problems and communication skills of the deaf; sort of an orientation for teachers to the field of deafness - basic things they might encounter | 1 |
| 20. | Have at least 2 students at a time; interpreters know something about the subject area; special sign language vocabulary for the field for interpreters | 1 |
| 21. | More visual aids - also effective with hearing students | 1 |
| 22. | Give more individual help with English - maybe students aren't taking advantage of the tutoring available; get together and decide the criteria for grades students often don't understand why they get low grades; more teachers should get acquainted with the deaf program | 1 |
| 23. | Interpreter must know about the material he's interpreting - use the same interpreter year after year; to build upon past experiences in the subject area and knowledge of the instructor | 1 |
| 24. | Interpreters seem to be the "key;" knowledge of the subject helps a lot; otherwise lot of time spent explaining things to the interpreter | 1 |

Improvements in the Classroom Situation Teacher Would Suggest (cont.)

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | None | 3 |
| 2. | Better screening before deaf students enter certain fields; some bad placements in the past - into Office Practice that really don't belong there; better background for the students; interpreter should have some knowledge of the subject area | 1 |
| 3. | There are times when an interpreter is not really necessary - maybe put the interpreter in another place where they might be of more help | 1 |
| 4. | More "field trip" type situations | 1 |
| 5. | Ideal now if interpreter is available | 1 |
| 6. | Have instructor who is proficient in sign language without losing the pace of the course. | 1 |
| 7. | Some sort of orientation for the hearing student to deafness | 1 |
| 8. | Deaf should take advantage of extra tutoring with the teacher; counselor should suggest to the student the advantages of extra tutoring | 1 |
| 9. | Would like to see more deaf students become interested in this subject area [technical drawing]; easier to find employment if there is a possibility of employing more than one deaf person | 1 |
| 10. | Everyone starts out together, but later put into a class that is more suited to his learning pace, separate "tracks" for each kind of student; all kinds of students in the courses now | 1 |
| 11. | Limit of 2 deaf student to a class would be better for the interpreters; more than two students should have more interpreters; 2-1 ratio of students to interpreters | 1 |
| 12. | To warn the teachers they will have deaf students; to know more about the individual before the quarter begins | 1 |
| 13. | There is no need for much improvement - deaf program here cooperates well; give extra classes in remedial reading here and/or before they come here; interpreter must know subject matter; would be good to have taken the classes themselves | 1 |
| 14. | Provisions for teachers to understand more about the deaf; more visual aid tapes should be made; interpreter should know the subject matter | 1 |
| 15. | More proficiency in sign language | 1 |
| 16. | Better communication - hearing student and teacher should learn more sign language; more communication between hearing and deaf students | 1 |
| 17. | Teachers learn sign language, but have never taken course himself - first, experience with deaf students; scheduled conferences with the deaf students - they very seldom come in for extra help | 1 |
| 18. | I wish that the deaf could read faster and comprehend more of the written instructions; develop a knowledge of English tenses | 1 |
| 19. | Would like an interpreter in the shop during shop times; only available now during lecture time, one hour a day; there could be a roving interpreter; teacher could arrange to be present while interpreter is present | 1 |
| 20. | Preparing more written material | 1 |
| 21. | Desirable if everyone knew sign language, but doesn't think it's worth the time for all people to learn sign language | 1 |

Improvements in the Classroom Situation Teacher Would Suggest (cont.)

SEATTLE

22. To have a special tutor who knows the subject area as well as sign language; utilize one of the good students as a tutor for the others; I have suggested this but was informed there might be jealousy among students. 1
23. Better background in language, math 1

TVI

1. None 7
2. More aids such as 3 - D models to describe various aspects of subject area 1
3. More audio-visual aids 1
4. Keep interpreter - deaf student ratio low (1-4). 1
5. Great to have interpreter all the time - that's impossible 1
6. Not changing interpreter as often as they presently do. 1
7. Fewer people overall in classes where deaf students are found. It takes more personal contact with deaf students 1
8. Emphasis on acquaintance with vocabulary and terminology of class with deaf students prior to entrance into classroom 1
9. More interpreters available 1
10. Deaf students have a poor math background; need more math 1
11. Personal interview with student before class begins to inform them of what to expect in industry 1
12. Reduction of class size; individualized instruction (2-3 students to one). 1
13. Deaf have hard time understanding large words - "large words" need to be broken down into simpler phrases 1
14. Find the way it is 1
15. Some students could have had more previous training. Interpreters should be chosen on basis of their knowledge of subject area 1
16. Skills of various jobs need to be clearly defined; curriculum objectives need to be fully related to these skills - instructor needs to be able to sign the few limited signs related to skills and objectives - limited signs because you shouldn't create an environment unlike a real-job situation 1
17. Maybe a session before quarter begins to explain the course work to interpreter. The interpreters get help from teacher to understand the subject matter 1
18. Beneficial to all students to have visual aids; something they can pick up, handle and see 1
19. Any program should make it a requirement that all teachers should be proficient in sign. Most teachers here do that voluntarily; interpreter takes proficiency potential away from teacher; limited class situation for other than lecture situation for individual work 1

Table 40

Why Teacher Feels the Deaf Student Does Not Have Adequate Comprehension of the Subject Matter

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | interpreter is not getting through (2nd hand information); student not applying himself - student rarely askes for extra help | 1 |
| 2. | his understanding is not evidenced in writing or in test grades | 1 |
| 3. | do much better in performance area than in more academic areas - stems back to ucation before coming here | 1 |
| 4. | students coming from carpentry or related field do not feel the class is relevant | 1 |
| 5. | lack of rap sessions and "brainstorming;" lack of interplay with other students | 1 |
| 6. | quality of interpreters is a factor - they can, providing they work and there are interpreters available | 1 |
| 7 | limited vocabulary; many are low in reading composition; trouble with simple instructions | 1 |
| 8. | no previous exposure to subject matter | 1 |
| 9. | teacher may not be getting message to interpreter; interpreter may not be interpreting correctly, terminology problem. | 1 |
| 10. | can't blame it on the interpreter; I don't know why - guess it's because they just don't understand; in a class with one deaf student, he understand; in class with 5 deaf students, they don't (maybe because they don't help each other) | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | these 2 students are from _____; lack of adequate back-ground | 1 |
| 2. | poor understanding of the technical part because of reading skills and terminology - can do o.k. with shop work | 1 |
| 3. | vocabulary - technical words or common words that have different connotations | 1 |
| 4. | basic skills low - perhaps the interpreter not as enthusiastic as desired | 1 |
| 5. | don't really know; might be because of the interpreter's lack of understanding of the subject matter | 1 |
| 6. | depends on background and attitude | 1 |
| 7. | lack of adequate communication; really need a sharp interpreter - not necessarily the students' competence but rather a communication gap | 1 |

Why Teacher Feels the Deaf Student Does Not Have Adequate Comprehension of the Subject Matter (cont.)

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8. | poor background (reading skills and comprehension) - lack of experience in life | 1 |
| 9. | deaf have trouble expressing ideas in writing; rather difficult in life | 1 |
| 10. | don't really know why; lack of technical knowledge - maybe understands initially, but cannot retain it | 1 |
| 11. | deaf understand but at a lower level of competency; miss side input and can't get effective transmission of information; some may have a lower level of performance perhaps due to poor background | 1 |
| 12. | lack of vocabulary - must break down some of the subject matter to a point where it is almost meaningless - lack of background | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | sometimes depends on background of students and their abilities to learn new terms | 1 |
| 2. | terminology of the sheet metal trade is barrier that a deaf student will have to understand and overcome | 1 |
| 3. | tremendous vocabulary problem in the field, but they can learn just like anyone else | 1 |
| 4. | lack of vocabulary is what holds them back | 1 |
| 5. | questions on test - trouble comprehending them | 1 |
| 6. | a lot of it is individual differences like hearing students. Terminology is a minor problem | 1 |
| 7. | goes back to poor math background: Square root can't be explained. | 1 |
| 8. | vocabulary is too low as far as reading is concerned | 1 |
| 9. | lack of prior background and basic language | 1 |
| 10. | not motivated - varied background | 1 |
| 11. | language barrier | 1 |
| 12. | not enough time to get material across | 1 |

Table 41

In What Way Interpreter Aid is Valuable

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Couldn't grasp subject matter adequately without interpreter - interpreter often seems to understand the psychology of the deaf | 1 |
| 2. | Communication - time consuming any other way | 1 |
| 3. | Students would have to apply selves more - impossible to get along without her | 1 |
| 4. | Without it, wouldn't be able to communicate; impossible to have an integrated class | 1 |
| 5. | Previous experience with lipreader - had to concentrate on facing student - can carry on normally in class with interpreter | 1 |
| 6. | Allows deaf students to come into regular class room | 1 |
| 7. | In this case interpreter knows subject and it's like having another teacher in class | 1 |
| 8. | Getting through to kids | 1 |
| 9. | She does all the work - problems can be communicated through here | 1 |
| 10. | Slow up class without her - don't think I'd be able to communicate adequately | 1 |
| 11. | Interpreter is better fingerspeller and much more competent | 1 |
| 12. | Easier to get through with interpreter aid - difficult to read student's signs and fingerspelling | |
| 13. | Good in physics - good personality - much easier than writing | 1 |
| 14. | Communication aid - saves time of having to write everything - also no text, so time factor important in teaching; kids can't read the information so must discuss in class | 1 |
| 15. | Communication - lab classes and classes where a lot of visual aid is present, probably not necessary | 1 |
| 16. | She tells students what is going on - the main means of communication; usually understand the material well themselves | 1 |
| 17. | No communication | 1 |
| 18. | To communicate | 1 |
| 19. | Improves communication problem; deaf only see visual portion of class and through interpreter gets at least some of the lecture portion | 1 |
| 20. | Only way to communicate with students | 1 |
| 21. | Need someone to interpret both ways - instructing and asking questions | 1 |
| 22. | Makes it easier to communicate with the deaf | 1 |
| 23. | Whenever a student appears not to understand, I use an interpreter to clarify | 1 |
| 24. | Communication - interpreter is indispensible | 1 |
| 25. | Communication | 1 |
| 26. | To get the subject matter across | 1 |
| 27. | Helps in communication of students' needs and desires to the teacher. Sometimes their written language is not clear to the t acher | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Communication | 3 |
| 2. | Communication - they are like a tutor - same person in several classes - good understanding of subject matter | 1 |

Table 41

In What Way Interpreter Aid is Valuable (cont.)

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3. | Impossible to communicate without interpreter at a rate that is acceptable to rest of class | 1 |
| 4. | Giving instructions and going over class material - interpreter is essential. Those interpreters who do more than just translate what the teacher says are really valuable | 1 |
| 5. | Impossible without them | 1 |
| 6. | Essential unless teacher is able to sign | 1 |
| 7. | Interpreter can explain in the deaf person's own language - time factor - interpreter can sign faster | 1 |
| 8. | Helps in communication | 1 |
| 9. | Communicate fluently with deaf students | 1 |
| 10. | Speeds up teaching - have been very cooperative in getting interpreter here when most needed | 1 |
| 11. | Communication - my interpreter has the course himself - it helps | 1 |
| 12. | Has established rapport with the student; can identify when the student doesn't understand; knows the student from previous quarters; knows when to feed in more information in order to get student to understand; knows when to explain or when the students are responding inappropriately; saves time | 1 |
| 13. | Communication - some are excellent, spent extra time individually with students | 1 |
| 14. | Necessary for lectures; material is somewhat complicated - cannot always be demonstrated | 1 |
| 15. | Communication - they understand the problems of the deaf; interpreter can recommend some changes to implement in the class | 1 |
| 16. | Communication - repeition of material | 1 |
| 17. | Essential to communication - allows deaf to participate in class discussion; interprets for films | 1 |
| 18. | To explain to interpret and reverse - interpret in class | 1 |
| 19. | Basis for communication | 1 |
| 20. | Communication - in every way ! Students can ask questions through interpreters | 1 |
| 21. | Get across information - some are better than others | 1 |
| 22. | Communication - has to be a go - between | 1 |
| 23. | Makes it easier during lecture; during lab no need - it's individual | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | only means of communication between teacher and student | 2 |
| 2. | facilitates and speeds communication - students look to interpreter for help | 1 |
| 3. | Helps in explanation of high technical areas; with a large number of deaf students, individual attention | 1 |
| 4. | Not as choppy as teacher would be giving them. Interpreter gets message across clearly. | 1 |
| 5. | Would be impossible for the student to progress as rapidly as they do now | 1 |
| 6. | Communicates for the teachers | 1 |

Table 41

In What Way Interpreter Aid is Valuable (cont.)

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7. | Helps with student's reading and writing and the area of vocabulary. | 1 |
| 8. | Explaining - all knowledge student gets comes through interpreters | 1 |
| 9. | Can conduct class as if deaf student is not present | 1 |
| 10. | Facilitates communication - most interpreters want to know about area to aid student better | 1 |
| 11. | Spends less time to explain what he meant with interpreter. Interpreter communicates her thoughts better to deaf students. | 1 |
| 12. | Much easier and quicker to get message to deaf student | 1 |
| 13. | Tutoring aid provided by interpreter is a help, especially with vocaublary | 1 |
| 14. | Saves time in communicating - prevents loss of attention on part of hearing student | 1 |
| 15. | You have someone right there who has receptive and expressive deaf communication skills | 1 |
| 16. | Interpreter puts over the explanation of the various teachings | 1 |
| 17. | Interpreter has good knowledge of deafness and deaf communication - interpretation word for word and pure interpretation (substituion) | 1 |
| 18. | Couldn't operate without one unless he (teacher) becomes a good signer. | 1 |
| 19. | When there's one deaf person in a class, an interpreter is needed to make him feel more like a part of the whole | 1 |
| 20. | Before class began, he went through outline with interpreter so that she would prepare student about day's lesson before the class began. | 1 |
| 21. | Communication is speeded up during lecture and video-tape sessions | 1 |
| 22. | Speeds communication | 1 |
| 23. | Before I took sign language I needed an interpreter to communicate to the students | 1 |
| 24. | Facilitates bridging communication gap; a must to communicate instructions | 1 |

Table 42

Reasons Teachers Seek Out Interpreters

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | If student has not done well on an assignment, attendance, make up work, low grades | 1 |
| 2. | To find out information about student problems student may have | 1 |
| 3. | If student isn't doing proper amount of work | 1 |
| 4. | Find out if students understand the material | 1 |
| 5. | Dress, conduct, work of student | 1 |
| 6. | Never had to, but if situation came up when interpreter needed - enrollment problems | 1 |
| 7. | To communicate | 1 |
| 8. | Make sure teacher is meeting needs of deaf students; if they understand the material | 1 |
| 9. | If student is behind or absent, to interpret special information; to ask questions about the student | 1 |
| 10. | Inquire about student | 1 |
| 11. | Class Problems | 1 |
| 12. | To correct the student's drawings; inform him of something wrong | 1 |
| 13. | Important points to get across | 1 |
| 14. | When a student wants to know something in particular | 1 |
| 15. | To make sure there's no problem in understanding assignments | 1 |
| 16. | Sometimes when it's hard to get through to a student; rarely, but it does happen | 1 |
| 17. | If student falls down in tests - late or absent from class; depression of student in class, personal problems | 1 |
| 18. | In classroom if it appears students don't understand (but student usually goes to interpreter before going to teacher) | 1 |
| 19. | When student appears not to understand something important | 1 |
| 20. | Any problem in relation to the deaf student, understanding the subject matter | 1 |
| 21. | If there is a problem with a student (not completing work; absences; late to class) | 1 |
| 22. | Problems of student | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | student late-to have her explain directions that may not be on the papers | 1 |
| 2. | see if students are getting materials | 1 |
| 3. | about required written work given daily - to discuss student's performance | 1 |
| 4. | student not up to date on required materials | 1 |
| 5. | to ask if the films are valuable. Always include students in these discussions to ask about assignments. Important to know if they understand | 1 |
| 6. | Find out if student understands subject matter | 1 |
| 7. | Student's progress and understanding of material | 1 |
| 8. | Particularly hard material-labwork; concerned if student was getting the ma material | 1 |

Reasons Teachers Seek Out Interpreters, (cont.)

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9. | Communication gap-deaf student doesn't seem to understand something. Talk about job opportunities with the student. | 1 |
| 10. | To get more information about the student and his problem | 1 |
| 11. | Not getting proper results and feels interpreter can help | 1 |
| 12. | Related to students' work | 1 |
| 13. | In Relationship to the course content | 1 |
| 14. | Try to help student with the subject matter. Things that might help student in their vocational pursuits. | 1 |
| 15. | Personal problems of the student (injury, one time) | 1 |
| 16. | If there is a problem-examination, tests, etc. | 1 |
| 17. | Find out what teacher, interpreter can do to help a student who's having trouble | 1 |
| 18. | To inquire if student understands material. If student needs additional help. | 1 |
| 19. | Quality of student work | 1 |
| 20. | Requests meeting | 1 |
| 21. | Because student hasn't studied as shown through assignments or quizzes | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Problems in getting through to student; technical information that is difficult to get across; new vocabulary | 1 |
| 2. | If a student is having trouble grade-wise or is showing some other problem (had bad attitudes and couldn't get along with other students) | 1 |
| 3. | If there will not be a class or the students are going on a field trip; just general information; behavioral patterns, academic progress | 1 |
| 4. | If student is doing something wrong or unsafe, I contact interpreter to explain or if student is having a particular problem | 1 |
| 5. | Student may have to take a written test - needs interpreter | 1 |
| 6. | Discuss student academic problems; to increase motivation, class attendance, work accomplishment | 1 |
| 7. | Testing, quest lectures, field trips and anything done in the auditorium; I speak to them about student progress | 1 |
| 8. | Mainly to explain something to deaf students; talk to interpreter about academic progress of deaf students | 1 |
| 9. | Special message to the students | 1 |
| 10. | To get more complete information on student progress and interest, attendance problems and class attitudes that might contribute to problems | 1 |
| 11. | To ask interpreter to communicate for me; I can sign but it saves time if interpreter signs for me, especially technical language | 1 |
| 12. | To put over a point or portion of a problem; academic problems with students | 1 |
| 13. | Student has difficulty with particular aspect of subject area; provide general information on testing | 1 |
| 14. | Assignments missed attendance problems, coming late to class | 1 |
| 15. | Get feedback on students' understanding of the material and my teaching pace | 1 |

Reasons Teachers Seek Out Interpreters, (cont.)

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 16. | To facilitate understanding of subject matter | 1 |
| 17. | Help in interpreting subject matter | 1 |
| 18. | When I can't understand what the student is trying to say; tell interpreter about student progress | 1 |
| 19. | Problems of vocabulary, tardiness | 1 |
| 20. | Student not understanding subject matter; absenteeism | 1 |
| 21. | Clarify instructions, answer questions student has; clarify lecture material | 1 |

Table 43

Reasons Interpreters Contact Teacher

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Problems of student | 3 |
| 2. | If they see something in class they want to discuss | 1 |
| 3. | To check about how student is doing | 1 |
| 4. | Problem with student, sometimes not related to the course | 1 |
| 5. | Complaints | 1 |
| 6. | Class notes schedules, homeworks, make-up work, etc. | 1 |
| 7. | If student wants to see instructor or has problems-clarification of class notes, etc. | 1 |
| 8. | Class problems - discuss legel problems, absentee ballota | 1 |
| 9. | Material to be covered on tests - when tests are scheduled - outside assignments | 1 |
| 10. | When student wants to discuss something, or know something | 1 |
| 11. | Spend extra time with student; personal problems of student | 1 |
| 12. | To make a suggestion, ask question for student, to give insight to a particular problem a student may have | 1 |
| 13. | When student isn't doing, will and wants extra help, etc. | 1 |
| 14. | If student has problem understanding - some interpreters have not contacted at all | 1 |
| 15. | Clarity in assignments | 1 |
| 16. | If student has problem with schoolwork | 1 |
| 17. | If a particular problem of a student occurs - absences, etc. | 1 |
| 18. | Contacts concerning grades, courses, advice or scheduling, etc. | 1 |
| 19. | Problems student is having in specific area | 1 |
| 20. | When a student wants to know something in particular | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Questions of the students | 1 |
| 2. | Tell things that teacher should be aware of-to suggest disciplinary measures for one student who comes in late; to inform teacher of problems that might come up in class because student is deaf | 1 |
| 3. | Feedback on what's happening - how it's going | 1 |
| 4. | Pass on information from the tutor. Certain difficulties student is having | 1 |
| 5. | Requests a meeting if he sees student is doing poorly | 1 |
| 6. | Progress of student-absences of students | 1 |
| 7. | Students have asked questions | 1 |
| 8. | Assignment clarification | 1 |
| 9. | If student isn't making satisfactory progress | 1 |
| 10. | To discuss student's performance, grade, pass/fail, etc. | 1 |
| 11. | To inform of the situation - why student is in the class - talk about deafness; questions or comments of the student | 1 |
| 12. | If a student doesn't understand | 1 |
| 13. | If they see a student is having trouble | 1 |
| 14. | Student problem | 1 |

Reasons Interpreters Contact Teacher (cont.)

SEATTLE

15. If student has a particular problem, e.g. personal, scholastic problems 1
16. To ask questions, clarifications-same thing as from a hearing student 1
17. Requests of the students - review of subject matter - reassurances of student status 1
18. To see how students are doing 1
19. If student has expressed a problem to interpreter feels the teacher should know about it. 1
20. Related to student work 1

TVI

1. Makeup assignment for student 1
2. Student is having problems in related class 1
3. Talk about interpreter scheduling 1
4. To get answers to student's questions 1
5. Questions of deaf students about procedures, etc. 1
6. If student doesn't understand material, doing poorly on tests, etc. 1
7. some remedial problem - how can I explain something better to the deaf students 1
8. Sitting arrangements; for purpose of more detailed definition of terminology; if they are aware of a problem a student has 1
9. Information or explanation of vocabulary or particular method 1
10. To clarify some aspect of subject matter for students 1
11. Interpreter tells teacher when she feels that the student doesn't understand 1
12. Must be informed to translate to student; to ask questions that deaf students have asked her 1
13. Administrative type problems - student to be excused for interviews, etc. 1
14. For answers to questions asked by deaf and for clarification of instructions 1
15. Explanation of drawing-geometry problem solving 1
16. See about changes in schedule at the beginning of quarter; interpreters ask about student problems 1
17. When a student is going to be missing from class; gives me a view of deaf student progress or "where his head is at" 1
18. If there will not be a class or the students are going on field trip; just general information; behavioral patterns; academic progress 1
19. Student is having problems in class or related area 1

Table 44

Improvements in Teacher/Interpreter Cooperation and Communication Teacher Would Suggest

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Interpreter needs textbook; needs to talk more; be more honest with each other about feelings in class | 1 |
| 2. | Maybe orientation session again - I don't know enough about the deaf to know if interpreter is good or bad | 1 |
| 3. | Need to know in beginning of semester when interpreter will be available | 1 |
| 4. | Interpreter must have background knowledge and interest in subject area | 1 |
| 5. | Maybe some of the teachers could improve; if teacher is doing her job, interpreter is doing hers | 1 |
| 6. | Keep same interpreter from previous sessions - in order to build upon their knowledge of terminology, etc. | 1 |
| 7. | Once a week discussion with interpreter and teacher about classwork-any problems that interpreter sees | 1 |
| 8. | Interpreter must have good humore; interpreter influences students more than the teacher does, she does 99% of the work | 1 |
| 9. | Interpreter should interpre everything; promote communication between teacher and students | 1 |
| 10. | Should be effort made to develop signs for scientific subjects; interpreter should inquire as to how student is doing in the class; interpreter should make effort to seek out instructor | 1 |
| 11. | Specialized interpreter - i.e., interpreter should have background knowledge of subject; interpreter should inform teacher of background information | 1 |
| 12. | Interpreter should know the material and have knowledge of terms; a "short hand" vocabulary for sign language | 1 |
| 13. | Interpreter should take the course before being allowed to interpret the course - not necessary for credit | 1 |
| 14. | Maybe make sure the interpreter assigned to English courses are adequately prepared in the subject matter | 1 |
| 15. | Not enough interpreters for the college | 1 |
| 16. | Interpreter shouldn't start off cold; rather, have some background or course work in accounting | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | None | 6 |
| 2. | Meet with interpreter before quarter begins | 1 |
| 3. | Working together to develop new signs - meeting before new quarter starts about the materials which will be covered - Also to decide how much time interpreter could spend with each student | 1 |
| 4. | Interpreter should have the technical background. Interpreter has to be learning or have learned the subject | 1 |
| 5. | Pre-school meeting (before quarter begins); especially for a new interpreter | 1 |
| 6. | Evaluations of course; more communication between teachers/interpreters as quarter goes along; some sort of critique after course between teachers and interpreters. Write down things that are good and bad. Teacher is then able to refine course | 1 |

Improvements in Teacher/Interpreter Cooperation and Communication Teacher Would Suggest (cont.)

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7. | Interpreters who know more about the subject matter | 1 |
| 8. | None - can't get any better | 1 |
| 9. | Schedulted meetings (maybe once a week) to discuss students. Set up interpreter for specific fields-specialists in the subject area | 1 |
| 10. | Scheduled meetings would be helpful - sign language class for teachers | 1 |
| 11. | Haven't really used the interpreter in conferences with the deaf students | 1 |
| 12. | Definite time to talk with interpreters | 1 |
| 13. | More training and practice in signs-A special vocabulary list for baking terms | 1 |
| 14. | To know sign language on the teacher's part and get more information about students | 1 |
| 15. | Tutoring service with compentent tutors. Interpreter knowledge in the subject area although this is probably difficult | 1 |
| 16. | The interpreter ability to handle sign language must be at a high level of proficiency | 1 |
| 17. | Would like to video-type lessons and have them interpreted | 1 |
| 18. | Teachers learn sign language | 1 |
| 19. | More opportunities for teachers to learn sign language. More contact with students during learning of sign language. More individual instruction in sign language | 1 |
| 20. | If possible, like to see interpreter chosen on basis of knowledge of course work. Continuation of classes; i.e. interpreter for same courses for several quarters | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | none | 16 |
| 2. | Problem of scheduling-can't get an interpreter - doesn't know how this can be remedied. | 1 |
| 3. | Pre-quarter orientation for interpreter concerning course work | 1 |
| 4. | In the classroom it is adequate | 1 |
| 5. | More time provided to instructors to develop working relationship with deaf students and interpreters | 1 |
| 6. | Interpreters got bored sitting in the typing class when there is no communication (when kids are typing) | 1 |
| 7. | A formal meeting, perhaps once a month, among interpreters, teachers and program heads | 1 |
| 8. | Good cooperation-maybe should have some special help sessions with just teachers, interpreters, and students | 1 |
| 9. | Need for more interpreters | 1 |
| 10. | Interpreter should know the subject matter; I try to keep the same interpreter for a full year | 1 |

Table 45

Reasons Teachers Contact Counselors

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Student not up to par in work or attendance | 1 |
| 2. | Personal, social, academic problems of students | 1 |
| 3. | Class attendance - academic misplacement | 1 |
| 4. | If student appears not to care about course; doing poorly - usually mention this to interpreter first | 1 |
| 5. | General information about deaf students | 1 |
| 6. | Check on students; absences, student is behind, special help | 1 |
| 7. | Disciplinary problems if there are any | 1 |
| 8. | Grade Trouble | 1 |
| 9. | If there was a student problem - not often now - seldom have problems | 1 |
| 10. | When something comes that involves more than subject matter | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | How students are getting along | 1 |
| 2. | If one particular problem with a student (behavior); if we get a request for job placement | 1 |
| 3. | Checking up on graduates. See if I can help with unions, etc. Problem in class with deaf student | 1 |
| 4. | Student problem with classwork - student has a work goal that is out of line - unrealistic goal - wanted to find out how this goal was acted upon | 1 |
| 5. | To discuss a particular student's performance in a course-ask about their goals | 1 |
| 6. | Find out where the student stands as far as their employment is concerned - Talking about getting employment for the students | 1 |
| 7. | Problems I can't solve myself | 1 |
| 8. | When a student is ready to be placed - failure in tests | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | If I have to order supplies that would come from Division of Vocational Rehavilitation (be funded by) | 1 |
| 2. | Absenteeism; suggestion for student to come in for extra work | 1 |
| 3. | Attendance, problems in class and in related classes | 1 |
| 4. | To go along with student for job interview | 1 |
| 5. | About attitudes, attending class, involvement in sport activities; sometimes job placement | 1 |
| 6. | Student problems-absenteeism, personal problems, girlfriend, car problems | 1 |
| 7. | If student has missed class, possibility of a job, an evaluation of student progress | 1 |
| 8. | Only if there is a problem with a particular student | 1 |
| 9. | If I feel a student is having exceptional problems - will discuss the possibility of placement in a different area or find out the core of the student's problem | 1 |

Table 45

Reasons Teachers Contact Counselors, (cont.)

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 10. | Behavioral and academic problem - stop by office to tell someone is doing well | 1 |
| 11. | If student has a problem in class, regarding vocational placement | 1 |
| 12. | Spoken to them about job placement | 1 |
| 13. | Major problem-student getting too far behind in class | 1 |
| 14. | To report on degree of progress tudent is making | 1 |
| 15. | Find out how the student is doing throughout the entire program, attendance problems, personal problems | 1 |
| 16. | Student attitude, attendance, illness, performance | 1 |
| 17. | Sees great academic or behavior changes in a person-erratic attendance pattern | 1 |
| 18. | Talk about something like a special project being done by deaf students that will be used for the deaf program. | 1 |
| 19. | Attendance, tardiness problems, trouble with shop project; poor grades, student doesn't understand | 1 |
| 20. | Academic problems, personal problems, personal hygiene | 1 |
| 21. | To determine procedural factors - speak to them about job placement; procurement of tools through the program for the student | 1 |
| 22. | Behavioral and academic problems - when there is no interest and no performance; maybe someone is not cut out for class; stop by to say someone is doing a good job | 1 |

Table 46

Reasons Counselors Contact Teacher

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Find out how student is doing | 2 |
| 2. | Attendance, grades and performance of student | 1 |
| 3. | Problem with student attendance; to check out student performance | 1 |
| 4. | Basic problems (personal problems) affecting student grades | 1 |
| 5. | Scheduling, attendance | 1 |
| 6. | Check on student; absences, student is behind, special help | 1 |
| 7. | Job potentials of student | 1 |
| 8. | Discuss common problems among deaf students | 1 |
| 9. | Contact about absences; to find out how student is doing | 1 |
| 10. | Check on students' attendance work | 1 |
| 11. | Inquire about students - any problems with a particular student | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | To find out if student might be able to return to home and help his own people | 1 |
| 2. | Drop in occasionally to check on students' progress, future plans for students | 1 |
| 3. | Student usually goes to counselor first then contacts teacher (grades, placement) | 1 |
| 4. | Student progress-registration | 1 |
| 5. | Check on progress of the students with the students' permission | 1 |
| 6. | Progress inquiries-notification of presence in class (to observe students) | 1 |
| 7. | If student is having difficulty or planning student program for future quarter | 1 |
| 8. | General information about student's performance | 1 |
| 9. | Check on kids--see how they're doing | 1 |
| 10. | Check on students - absences | 1 |
| 11. | Current or prospective students | 1 |
| 12. | Ascertain proper placement of students. "reassurance" meetings with students | 1 |
| 13. | For information about a student performance | 1 |
| 14. | To ask about student's ability to move into another course-progress | 1 |
| 15. | Check on progress of student; teacher having problems | 1 |
| 16. | Wondering how student is getting along | 1 |
| 17. | Check on well-being of students, see how they are adjusting to class | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Student problems, absenteeism, personal problem - girlfriend, car problems | 1 |
| 2. | To see how student is progressing | 1 |
| 3. | Student academic difficulties, absenteeisms | 1 |
| 4. | Financial, personal or academic problems of students | 1 |
| 5. | If the student must be gone for the day | 1 |
| 6. | Questions about how student is doing in class - teacher is informed by the counselor | 1 |

Reasons Counselors Contact Teacher, (cont.)

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7. | General evaluating of students, see about new students getting into program, withdrawal, finding job, etc. | 1 |
| 8. | Find out how the student is doing | 1 |
| 9. | Explore the idea of a new skill area for a deaf student | 1 |
| 10. | Find out how the student is doing throughout the entire program, attendance problems, personal deaf student problems | 1 |
| 11. | Student performance, attendance; field trip | 1 |
| 12. | Someone wants to enroll, someone needs help, test scores | 1 |
| 13. | Is rarely contacted | 1 |
| 14. | Only if there is a problem with a particular student | 1 |
| 15. | To get more specific information about a student and his work | 1 |
| 16. | Number of students per class, number that can be handled, how some students are doing in class; what problems are experienced in classes | 1 |
| 17. | Academic problems, personal problems, personal hygiene | 1 |
| 18. | Student problems, academic progress of student | 1 |
| 19. | Attendance, tardiness problems, trouble with shop project - poor grades, student doesn't understand. | 1 |

Table 47

Improvements in Teacher/Counselor Communication and Cooperation Teacher Would Suggest

DELGADO

1. Duty of counselor to contact teacher about problems of deaf student 1
2. School should let teacher know who counselor is for student in his class - should be available at time student is enrolled in his class 1
3. I don't feel that job is being done as it could be by counselor and interpreters 1
4. Should be a way to screen students according to interests and talents 1
5. Weekly meetings - may be incorporated into the interpreter meeting 1
6. After mid term exams, counselor should review grades, etc. with the teacher - should seek out the teacher 1
7. Teachers could learn basic sign language - should have scheduled meetings 1
8. Counselor should get information about student to teacher 1
9. More contact obviously - all teachers told who the counselors for the deaf are, where they are, phone #'s, etc. 1
10. Should be scheduled appointments (once every six weeks - at least a phone call). Counselor ought to let teacher know if student brings a problem about class 1
11. Should be a formal meeting - at least a couple times a semester 1
12. Should set up meetings with counselors 1
13. More placement into jobs; try to find area where the deaf students can function without a handicap; e.g., a high noise situation 1
14. Counselor perhaps should get information about students to teacher 1

SEATTLE

1. Counselor should contact teacher or make his name known at least. Maybe a group meeting of teachers who have deaf students coordinated by a counselor. 1
2. Has to be some improvement. Kids are not progressing in the technical areas. Interpreters and tutors appear not to be adequately prepared themselves in technical area. 1
3. To know more about individual students before the quarter begins 1
4. Depends on interpreter; would like to know counselors are available. Counselors are third parties. Emphasis should be more on interpreter/student/teacher relationship 1
5. Would like to know more about the background of deaf student in the class, particularly in the area of skills or other handicaps 1
6. Orientation for teachers in the regular program during workdays before school actually starts. Notification that deaf student will be in the class before school starts. 1
7. Not necessary to see a counselor. Tell interpreter and she transfers the information to a counselor 1
8. Should have scheduled meetings at least 5 times/quarter like the counselor. Come in and give background on student; suggestions for the teacher 1
9. As long as counselor is available, this is sufficient 1

Improvements in Teacher/Counselor Communication and Cooperation Teacher Would Suggest (cont.

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 10. | Place should be a combination of counselor for the deaf and a counselor from the particular subject area; help the student get into a certain area; a conference at least twice a quarter. If a teacher gets complaints about a teacher, the teacher should be notified. Maybe a counselor should visit the classes | 1 |
| 11. | Meeting for meeting's sake not necessary. Just knowing the personnel is available if there is a problem is sufficient. | 1 |
| 12. | More follow up on progress/achievement of the student, more discussion of student's goals and objectives. | 1 |
| 13. | Don't feel there is any value in communicating with counselor unless there is a "human type" problem. Feel counselor should talk to students not to instructors. | 1 |
| 14. | Counselor should come into the classroom and make suggestions to teachers about how to deal with the students. | 1 |
| 15. | More frequent input about the deaf program to the teachers in the college. | 1 |
| 16. | More personal contact with employers by a counselor. | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Inform student of what to expect in course and industry before course begins | 1 |
| 2. | More time available to communicate | 1 |
| 3. | Pre-quarter meeting to discuss student I will have in class - problems, abilities to expect | 1 |
| 4. | Functioning well as is | 1 |
| 5. | By understanding a little bit more about the background of student (family problems, etc.); would help in dealing with student | 1 |
| 6. | Should do some research into area that students can be placed. What are the limitations of deafness in the commercial art field? Counselors should focus the deaf student into an area in the field rather than deal with it in a shot gun approach | 1 |

Table 48

Reasons Administrators Contact Teacher

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Personal problems of student affecting his performance | 1 |
| 2. | Progress reports on student; attendance | 1 |
| 3. | Discuss students in general | 1 |
| 4. | To check on students - job potential - proper placement | 1 |
| 5. | To see if all is O.K. with a particular student - check out instructors to see if they are doing their job | 1 |
| 6. | Any major problems that might arise in the program | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Check up on students' performance | 1 |
| 2. | Prospective students | 1 |
| 3. | Meetings are intermittent - can't remember what they are about; perhaps about interpreting services | 1 |
| 4. | attendance, check-up on student s..any problems | 1 |
| 5. | Various institutions that are interested in the program; seek information about this particular subject area. To set up meetings with representatives of various programs; to explain about department here | 1 |
| 6. | Student problem in matter of instruction or ability | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Academic difficulties | 1 |
| 2. | General - see if all is alright | 1 |
| 3. | Administrator contacts me just to say hello, to introduce a new student, to show the facilities to someone | 1 |
| 4. | Check on student progress | 1 |
| 5. | Expertise in media, development of programs to explain deaf program | 1 |
| 6. | Primarily, to introduce a new student | 1 |
| 7. | To explore ideas of new skill areas for deaf student | 1 |
| 8. | More for general deaf news (school newspaper) and personal information on student | 1 |
| 9. | Scheduling; classroom activities | 1 |
| 10. | General information - tell him good things about deaf program | 1 |
| 11. | Seeks me out for special art projects for the deaf department | 1 |
| 12. | Attendance, tardiness problems, trouble with shop project - poor grades, student doesn't understand | 1 |

Table 49

Reasons Counselors Contact Administrators

DELGADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | generally to discuss how deaf students are doing | 1 |
| 2. | difficulty scheduling interpreter | 1 |
| 3. | as a whole about the program - have a special interest in the program | |
| 4. | when student is doing poorly | 1 |

SEATTLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | check up on students' performance | 1 |
| 2. | to ask for more sign language classes | 1 |
| 3. | personal problems of the students' placement of the student follow up - curiosity about students who are employed | 1 |
| 4. | student's problems in matter of instruction or ability | 1 |

TVI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | academic difficulties | 1 |
| 2. | student progress reports or if need to know something about deaf people from other states like different signs used | 1 |
| 3. | to seek information on students who have been placed out of state | 1 |
| 4. | to keep interpreters that have had the classes before. Most problems handled through counselor | 1 |
| 5. | if visitor goes through school, she takes her down to meet administrator not usually administrative, just casual | 1 |
| 6. | counseling session to help student in class | 1 |
| 7. | administrative reasons, primarily | 1 |
| 8. | student problems or ways to help student do a better job in course; use of new material | 1 |
| 9. | concerning the overal objectives of the program for the deaf in particular skill area | 1 |
| 10. | more for general deaf news (works on school newspaper) and personal information on student | 1 |
| 11. | media project relating to the deaf program but not directly to one student | 1 |
| 12. | seek him out to tell him good things about deaf programs - general information | 1 |
| 13. | attendance, tardiness problems, trouble with shop project, poor grades, student doesn't understand | 1 |

Table 50

Improvements Teacher Would Suggest in Teacher/Administrator Cooperation and Communicatio

DELGADO

1. A planned meeting of some kind. Teachers who have deaf students invited to to see the program facilities and meet the people. 1
2. Administrator should keep tabs on the counselors and what they are doing with the student. Not as important for teachers to communicate with the administrator. Teachers who have deaf students could possibly meet with the administrators. Some kind of guidelines for teachers (when they encounter problems - suggestions for the teacher); introductory course on how to relate to deaf students. 1
3. Better handling of forms and reports - reports should go to deaf program as well as department heads. 1
4. Get together occasionally and have things explained to the teachers; more communication between the teachers and the deaf program. 1
5. Administrator of this particular program should get more involved in the program and with his students; not enough personal interest in the staff and students. 1
6. They ought to organize some kind of program to acquaint the regular faculty about the goals of their program - set up meetings with counselors, etc. 1
7. Try to make texts available to interpreters - for the interpreter to take home and study - notes kept in a library or reference room. 1

SEATTLE

1. Counselors could do the contacts 1
2. Feels he is very cooperative but generally works through a counselor regarding students 1
3. Not necessary-counselor should be able to take care of the problems. 1
4. Feels that reports of the interpreter are far more important than any meeting set up with administrator or counselor. 1
5. Doesn't see a need for a meeting with him. Many things can be handled on a lower level. 1
6. Adequate now, if needed knows where they are. 1
7. If needed, to know that they are available. 1
8. No suggestions-just to be available. 1
9. No need to talk with him, the more we can treat a deaf student like a hearing student the better 1
10. Method of grouping according to student's abilities should be improved. 1
11. More teacher training in sign language. Fewer people in sign language class or more teachers - too crowded now; need more personal contact in sign language class. 1
12. More information about services available in order to take advantage of them. Perhaps discussion about student's performance. 1
13. Might be some type of pre-test to place students.. Notification that deaf student will be in the class. 1

Table 50

Improvements Teacher Would Suggest in Teacher/Administrator Cooperation and Communication (cont.)

TVI

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Providing feedback to teacher regarding placement of student. | 1 |
| 2. Maybe a periodic meeting (at least once a year) with all deaf program staff and teachers-purpose to describe the program's goals. | |
| 3. Inform student of what to expect in course and industry before course begins. | 1 |
| 4. Some feedback on placement research so that department can develop some appropriate materials need a better employment picture. | 1 |
| 5. Pre-quarter teacher/counselor/administration, meeting - maybe special meeting in summer/problem of time here. | 1 |
| 6. If teachers are going to deal with the deaf, the administrators should require the teachers to maintain a proficiency in signs. | |

Table 51

Additional Information and Comments

DELGADO

1. Counselors should check with the teachers more often. Teachers could make some periodic reports on the students to the counselors. If student is having problems, teachers should be made aware of this. Counselor should encourage students to air their problems.
2. Poor attendance of deaf students at student professional organization meetings.
3. A pleasure teaching deaf students; deaf students haven't been the best or the worst; I like them.
4. I feel interpreters should be given full-time status; they are the key to the whole program; get more money and fringe benefits; good program and productive program.
5. I feel that the administrator probably gets around to meeting with each student at least once or twice each semester. He has in the past and should now. I feel there has been a lot of progress in the past five years. I would like to see more interest in the deaf community--would like to see more adult deaf people enroll in the program. I would like to see more schools like this throughout the country. Small minority of the deaf are capable of attending a University or Master's program of any kind. Deaf deserve more praise and compliments.
6. Hearing students get a lot out of deaf student's "oral" reports. Impressed with facial expression and gestures and their role in communication. Very impressed with the program.
7. Weekly tests are good indicators of how the students are doing. I think it's more important to be a good teacher than communicating with counselor and administrator. Most of my former deaf students got good jobs. I feel talents and interests should be the determiners of a student's program. Some (not many) of the deaf students have been misplaced. Some very smart boys have been in plumbing or something like that and could do well in other things. About 20% are probably misplaced. Maybe 10% of these are placed by their counselors--maybe 10% are in the wrong program because of their own doing.
8. A worthwhile program but more communication.
9. Worked out very well in this situation. In a work sicuation, proves deaf can function on a level with hearing.
10. Try to improve the courses to meet the demands of industry. I try to treat the deaf as I would all other people.
11. Overall picture--pretty good job of keeping track of their students. Hard to keep track of students; unless student is doing poorly; I won't seek him out. Most students at Delgado tend to do poorly. Whole classes are low performerse--hard to say deaf student is any worse. Only students who stand out are outstanding performers or other way around. Concerned with developing capabilities to perform more than "brain power." Not sure what the aim of the deaf program is here--to go on to a four-year program? to produce technicians? Should be made more aware of the aim of the deaf program.

Additional Information and Comments (cont.)

DELGADO

12. Interpreters must have the capacity to understand the subject matter.
13. Whole-heartedly in favor of the deaf program here and I favor complete integration of the deaf students with hearing students.
14. Glad to see the program here--needed--should be more around the country. Hope it continues--enjoy deaf students. Good workers.
15. Tendency to think deaf students need more attention which may not necessarily be there.
16. Average of deaf students has been higher than hearing students. Very enthusiastic about the deaf program.
17. Would like to see the program continued--a good program.
18. Some previous vocational training with deaf children before teacher can accept a job at Delgado. Perhaps a short introductory course in sign language. Deaf kids come in on their own more often than hearing kids. Most commercial artists in New Orleans need a Master's to work here. Not enough places in New Orleans to employ all these people. Ratio of designers to sign painters is low. Instructors Instructors should know some basic communication skills. If there is an assigned time for instructors to learn sign language, they would.
19. I feel fortunate to have the students so far. Attendance, grades, performance are all good.
20. I use the board a lot--put key words on the board. I feel there's very little communication between self and deaf students. I feel the deaf have not been adequately prepared. I have been instructed to treat them the same as other students. Haven't been taught (or haven't learned) syntactical English. Syntax is completely wrong. Hearing students don't have that problem. If the program rigidly enforced the equal standards, a large proportion wouldn't pass. Still, it's not their fault.
21. Good to use handicapped people in certain jobs. I want to help people find where they fit. Deaf students are good students in general. Very happy with performance of deaf students. More publicity and public relations work for the deaf program.
22. Trades where they are given a set of specifications and have to come up with a product to meet them are good for deaf students. Those formerly in the program have been good and sought-after employees.
23. It is disarming to walk into class and find deaf students without prior knowledge. Should be some notification that deaf students and interpreters will be present, especially for new teachers.

Additional Information and Comments (cont.)

SEATTLE

1. Keep it going! Deaf should have equal educational opportunities.
2. Limited experience--must have a well-trained interpreter. Would be good to have interpreter who is knowledgeable in the subject matter. Should have some prior warning if there is to be a deaf student or students in the class.
3. Psychology of deafness in orientation course is especially good. Of all the administrative offices in the college, the program for the deaf seems to be the best. Leadership is of ultimate importance and I feel the deaf program has that leadership. Industry's response to these deaf people has [illegible] as mine--have had an administrative view of the [illegible]ment opportunities for the deaf in the past, but I have changed my mind about this. Administrator here has changed his mind about the success of the deaf program. I feel industry's response is changing. Many deaf students are now doing a good job and will change attitudes industry has about the deaf. Welding department has placed 11 out of 12 students-one dropped out before his training was completed.
4. Wonderful program! Enjoy working with them.
5. Interpreters have been excellent.
6. Some literature should be sent to instructors about deaf students. Information sent about what services are available.
7. More communication with the department might help--willing to help.
8. Don't feel the job is being done in my area--"missing the boat" somewhere along the line. Periodic meetings among student/tutor/teacher/counselor to try to find out where the problems lie.
9. Welding teachers go out and find jobs for the deaf kids. Not really part of their job. Placed all deaf students that went through their program. Whole program has people who are very cooperative. Deaf program here better organized than program for hearing students. Regarding placement--if student doesn't go to work, you are not accomplishing the goal. I feel that people with authority should support the deaf and help them to get jobs and be better accepted. City and state should hire more deaf people. Deaf need someone to "go to bat" for them. I am really upset about this problem. I am not condemning the deaf program, but the school authorities and bureaucrats.
10. My first encounter with deaf students. Would like some feedback from the deaf students. Fantastic project.
11. First experience with deaf students. If the student I have was totally deaf, perhaps would want more information, but my students can partially hear.

Additional Information and Comments (cont.)

SEATTLE

12. Feel it's successful now. Proven by people being able to find employment in their area. I have made video tapes of lessons--helpful for student to go over lessons many times. Cooperation between interpreter and teacher on their own. I plan to do more of this. To make up a series of lessons in this department that designed for the deaf. TV tapes--also audio for benefit of hearing students.
13. Don't skimp on the interpreters. Sometimes hard of hearing are put into a class without interpreter. They are at a distinct disadvantage. Must have interpreters for these people also.
14. For the interpreter to pass on any important information from the classroom to the deaf program administrator. A problem that has come up--interpreter had to leave because of illness--hard to "re-educate" the new interpreter. I emphasized field trip activities for the deaf students.
15. Deaf have poor background, especially in reading--lack of comprehension perhaps due to lack of experience in life. A credit course for students in sign language. More hearing students would interact if they could sign. A general education credit elective. Any criticism of teachers should be brought to the teachers directly, then to deaf program supervisors (by the interpreters). Observation times should be set up. I have not been notified in the past of visits. Interpreter didn't have a chance to show a true picture of her skills. Neither of the deaf students in one class meet the speed requirements for this course. Sending out people who are not qualified is poor for the school, the teacher, and the student. Rather have the student take the course twice than going into a higher course unprepared.
16. I think it's a strong program. Should maybe be more time spent in conference with only the deaf students and the teacher and the interpreter. Attendance well above average.
17. Improvement would be to have the instructor competent in sign language. More effective and less costly in the long run.
18. Absences are less with deaf students. Highly motivated--a pleasure to work with the deaf. Well-organized program in the college! Work hard to help the students.
19. I feel the program definitely pays for itself, both financially and humanly.
20. To compile a dictionary of terminology in drawing for the student would be helpful.
21. I also have some deaf high school students here. 3 hour per week program. Also a counselor who works with these kids. Subsidizing students is bad for the school. Only reason students come to school is to get the money. I think the deaf program is great--very progressive program here.

Additional Information and Comments (cont.)

SEATTLE

22. Sampling--students scheduled to try different areas during prep quarter. Administrators come over during that time and talk with instructors and discuss each student. I have taken a class in sign language. Deaf students also help with signs. Willing to take another course in signs if given for credit. An orientation for video tape teachers involving movies, sign language--all aspects of deafness. I would like to see another class in advanced sign language offered for credit. Also offer sign language class for regular students.

TVI

1. I think the program is terrific. It gives these students a chance to learn a useful trade and become an asset to society. They enjoy what they are doing in the school and are able to get employment in the field they are trained for. Which makes them a part of the work force that helps build a useful life for them and their families.
2. Should have a better selection method. Should be able to keep up with the hearing students in math, especially. Should select a person who is really interested in this area and wants to go into this field when through with school.
3. Deaf students do not have good language backgrounds. Improvements should be made in lower schools--not good backgrounds in math.
4. Deaf kids cannot understand what they are reading. You give them jobs and they do them well--on tests, questions are asked about that job and cannot be answered. Real problem with reading.
5. Specific units of study can be developed for definite areas of employment. The curriculum should be more specific for these areas and more in depth; i.e., airbrush retouching and illustration, technical illustration for publication, etc.
6. I teach better because of handicapped students--I pace myself, use overhead, prepare my materials better-make more connections and assume less.
7. St. Paul TVI is doing a great job for deaf people, not only in preparation but also in overcoming their communication barrier.
8. Should be an hour alloted each day so interpreter and student could have tutoring time.
9. The program for the deaf is an outstanding program. It is good for the deaf student as well as the community and its citizens. The teaching pace in a hard of hearing and hearing class should not be slowed because of the hearing--in many cases it is. The classroom environment should be much like the "on the job" supervisor/worker environment. Too much signing and too great a dependence on interpreters could create an artificial class setting. The deaf could have difficulty adjusting to the job. More time available for teacher development and training aid development. Great program!!
10. Students do a better job when teacher shows personal interest and desire and ability to communicate rather than going through an interpreter.

APPENDIX K

Tables: Interpreters

Table 52

Subjects Interpreted at Each Program

| DELGADO | # |
|---|---|
| English | 6 |
| Orthotics/Prosthetics | 4 |
| Drafting | 3 |
| Printing | 3 |
| History | 3 |
| Biology | 2 |
| Electricity | 2 |
| Sociology | 2 |
| Physics | 2 |
| Mathematics | 2 |
| Algebra | 2 |
| Accounting | 2 |
| Graphic Arts | 2 |
| Bookkeeping | 1 |
| Data Processing | 1 |
| Construction Costs | 1 |
| Unit Record | 1 |
| Business Management | 1 |
| Trigonometry | 1 |
| Computer | 1 |
| Library Science | 1 |
| Business Communication | 1 |
| Shop Safety | 1 |
| Clerical Practice | 1 |
| First Aid | 1 |
| Personal Finance | 1 |
| Business Mathematics | 1 |
| Business Law | 1 |
| Personal Development | 1 |
| Chemistry | 1 |
| Psychology | 1 |
| Art | 1 |
| Cooking | 1 |
| Health | 1 |
| Filing | 1 |
| Typing | 1 |
| Cabinet Making | 1 |

| SEATTLE | # |
|---|---|
| Typing | 16 |
| Accounting | 4 |
| Baking | 3 |
| Welding | 3 |
| Drafting | 2 |
| Recreation Technology | 2 |
| Office Machine | 2 |
| Instruction of Sign Language Classes for Staff | 1 |
| Interpret for Staff meetings, job interviews, and coordinator of interpreter services | 1 |
| Communication Skills | 1 |
| Blueprint Reading | 1 |
| Auto Body | 1 |
| Speech | 1 |
| Job Sampling | 1 |
| American Institution | 1 |
| Chemistry | 1 |
| Environment and Man | 1 |
| Carpentry | 1 |
| Data Processing | 1 |
| Sociology | 1 |
| English | 1 |
| Mathematics | 1 |
| Zoology | 1 |
| Reading | 1 |
| Language | 1 |
| Adult Basic Education | 1 |
| Business and Environment | 1 |
| Heavy Duty Diesel | 1 |
| Horology | 1 |
| History | 1 |
| Psychology | 1 |
| Physics | 1 |
| Family Life | 1 |
| Science | 1 |

| TVI | # |
|---|---|
| Graphic Arts | 6 |
| Physics | 3 |
| Machine Tool | 3 |
| Business Machines/ General Office Practice | 2 |
| Drawing | 2 |
| Drafting | 2 |
| Geometric Dimensions | 2 |
| Industrial Human Relations | 1 |
| Cabinet Making | 1 |
| Reading | 1 |
| Typing | 1 |
| Welding | 1 |
| Highway Technology | 1 |
| Production Art | 1 |
| Hotel and Restaurant Cooking | 1 |
| Carpenter's Mathematics | 1 |
| Business Mathematics | 1 |
| Printing | 1 |

Table 53

Additional Comments

DELGADO

1. There is a need for more trust among staff members, more confidence in others. Better communication is needed among staff members.
2. The atmosphere and rapport between administrator and other staff members (including interpreters) sometimes is cool and strained. I wish that there were more a feeling of cooperation and oneness of purpose but apparently it is covered up at times by secretiveness, pettiness, and apparent distrust and competitiveness. Perhaps this is to be expected. I don't know.

SEATTLE

1. I think it's a great program. It's really new and has a long way to go, but it has a really good start. I would like to see more counselors that are qualified to work with the deaf (if they started this in schools before the deaf kids got to college age, we wouldn't have the problems we have now).
2. Interpreters should be permitted to exchange student information more freely with instructors.
3. The emphasis should be put on vocabulary building for deaf students and interpreters. Interpreter training should be instituted. Once a month there are staff meetings that pertain to all of the staff, and they are very informative.
4. Our staff gets along very well with each other.
5. I would like to develop videotapes for training of interpreters. Money is needed to do this (the staff wants to do this--there is no in-program opposition). Also, videotaping of classroom lectures with interpreting services.
6. Working at Seattle Community College is a very satisfying experience for me. I've made many new friends and broadened my knowledge in many ways that would otherwise have escaped me.
7. I enjoy the job and love working with deaf students. I think the head interpreter is terrific (the job can be very tiring at times).
8. I feel the program is very successful. The students grow and develop their learning and job skills well here as well as learning independence, self-confidence and working and mingling with the hearing students. The hearing staff and student body also come to understand about dafness and deaf individuals. I very much enjoy interpreting and find the experience of working with the students and classes fulfilling and satisfactory.

TVI

1. I think that the program at TVI is great but I would like to see the deaf (with interpreters) enrolling in many more schools and universities.

University of Minnesota Research, Development and Demonstratio
Center in Education of Handicapped Children

(Place of publication shown in parentheses where applicable)

1. D. Moores, S. Fisher & M. Harlow. Post-secondary programs for the deaf: VI. Summary a Report #80. December 1974.

2. M. Harlow, S. Fisher & D. Moores. Post-secondary programs for the deaf: V. Follow-Up Report #79. December 1974.

3. R. Wozniak. Psychology and education of the learning disabled child in the Soviet Union December 1974.

4. M. Thurlow, P. Krus, R. Howe, A. Taylor & J. Turnure. Measurement of Weight Unit: A fo Report #77. December 1974.

5. M. Thurlow, P. Krus, R. Howe, A. Taylor & J. Turnure. Money Unit: A formative evaluati December 1974.

6. M. Harlow, D. Moores & S. Fisher. Post-secondary programs for the deaf: IV. Empirical Report #75. December 1974.

7. C. Mueller & S. Samuels. Initial field test and feasibility study of the hypothesis/tes cedures in the special education classroom. Research Report #74. December 1974.

8. P. Krus, M. Thurlow, J. Turnure & A. Taylor. Summative evaluation of the Time with the Measurement and Time Program. Research Report #73. October 1974.

9. P. Krus, M. Thurlow, J. Turnure & A. Taylor. Summative evaluation of the Measurement of Measurement and Time Program. Research Report #72. October 1974.

10. P. Krus, M. Thurlow, J. Turnure & A. Taylor. Summative evaluation of the Measurement of Measurement and Time Program. Research Report #71. October 1974.

11. P. Krus, M. Thurlow, J. Turnure & A. Taylor. Summative evaluation of the Money Unit of and Time Program. Research Report #70. October 1974.

12. P. Krus, M. Thurlow, J. Turnure, A. Taylor & R. Howe. The formative evaluation design o Project. Occasional Paper #31. October 1974.

J. Rynders, J. Horrobin; L. Wangsness & J. Swanson. The severe nature of verbal learnin Down's Syndrome (mongoloid) children. Research Report #69. August 1974.

University of Minnesota Research, Development and Demonstration
Center in Education of Handicapped Children

(Place of publication shown in parentheses where applicable)

& M. Harlow. Post-secondary programs for the deaf: VI. Summary and Guidelines. Research
cember 1974.

& D. Moores. Post-secondary programs for the deaf: V. Follow-Up Data Analysis. Research
cember 1974.

ogy and education of the learning disabled child in the Soviet Union. Research Report #78.

R. Howe, A. Taylor & J. Turnure. Measurement of Weight Unit: A formative evaluation. Research
cember 1974.

R. Howe, A. Taylor & J. Turnure. Money Unit: A formative evaluation. Research Report #76.

& S. Fisher. Post-secondary programs for the deaf: IV. Empirical Data Analysis. Research
cember 1974.

s. Initial field test and feasibility study of the hypothesis/test word recognition pro-
special education classroom. Research Report #74. December 1974.

J. Turnure & A. Taylor. Summative evaluation of the Time with the Clock Unit of the Money,
Time Program. Research Report #73. October 1974.

J. Turnure & A. Taylor. Summative evaluation of the Measurement of Weight Unit of the Money,
Time Program. Research Report #72. October 1974.

J. Turnure & A. Taylor. Summative evaluation of the Measurement of Length Unit of the Money,
Time Program. Research Report #71. October 1974.

J. Turnure & A. Taylor. Summative evaluation of the Money Unit of the Money, Measurement,
n. Research Report #70. October 1974.

J. Turnure, A. Taylor & R. Howe. The formative evaluation design of the Vocabulary Development
ional Paper #31. October 1974.

Wangsness & J. Swanson. The severe nature of verbal learning deficits in preschool
loid) children. Research Report #69. August 1974.

14. R. Riegel. Reliability of children's sorting strategies using alternate forms of the SOR #68. August 1974.

15. S. Fisher, D. Moores, & M. Harlow. Post-secondary programs for the deaf: III. Internal #67. September, 1974.

16. W. Bart. A set-theoretic model for the behavioral classification of environments. Occas

17. D. Krus, W. Bart & P. Airasian. Ordering theory and methods. Occasional Paper #28. Jul

18. B. Egeland & A. Thibodeau. Selective attention of impulsive and reflective children. Re

19. R. Hoffmeister, B. Best & D. Moores. The acquisition of sign language in deaf children o Report. Research Report #65. June 1974.

20. P. Krus. Use of family history data to predict intellectual and educational functioning four to seven. Research Report #64. June 1974.

21. P. Krus. Analyzing for individual differences in evaluating compensatory education progr June 1974.

22. J. Rondal. The role of speech in the regulation of behavior. Research Report #63. June

23. N. Buium, J. Rynders, & J. Turnure. A semantic-relational-concepts based theory of langu applied to Down's Syndrome children: Implication for a language enhancement program May 1974.

24. S. Fisher, M. Harlow & D. Moores. Post-secondary programs for the deaf: II. External v #61. March 1974.

25. D. Moores, M. Harlow, & S. Fisher. Post-secondary programs for the deaf: I. Introducti Report #60. February 1974.

26. D. Krus. Synopsis of basic theory and techniques of order analysis. Occasional Paper #

27. S. Samuels, J. Spiroff & H. Singer. Effect of pictures and contextual conditions on lea Paper #25. March 1974.

28. A. Taylor, M. Thurlow & J. Turnure. Elaboration as an instructional technique in the vo EMR children. Research Report #59. March 1974.

29. N. Buium & J. Turnure. The universality of self-generated verbal mediators as a means o cesses. Research Report #58. January 1974.

ity of children's sorting strategies using alternate forms of the SORTS test. Research Report
74.

& M. Harlow. Post-secondary programs for the deaf: III. Internal view. Research Report
1974.

retic model for the behavioral classification of environments. Occasional Paper #29. July 1974.

Airasian. Ordering theory and methods. Occasional Paper #28. July 1974.

deau. Selective attention of impulsive and reflective children. Research Report #66. July 1974.

st & D. Moores. The acquisition of sign language in deaf children of deaf parents: Progress
h Report #65. June 1974.

ily history data to predict intellectual and educational functioning longitudinally from ages
Research Report #64. June 1974.

or individual differences in evaluating compensatory education programs. Occasional Paper #27.

of speech in the regulation of behavior. Research Report #63. June 1974.

& J. Turnure. A semantic-relational-concepts based theory of language acquisition as
s Syndrome children: Implication for a language enhancement program. Research Report #62.

& D. Moores. Post-secondary programs for the deaf: II. External view. Research Report
.

& S. Fisher. Post-secondary programs for the deaf: I. Introduction and overview. Research
ruary 1974.

basic theory and techniques of order analysis. Occasional Paper #26. April 1974.

ff & H. Singer. Effect of pictures and contextual conditions on learning to read. Occasional
h 1974.

& J. Turnure. Elaboration as an instructional technique in the vocabulary development of
Research Report #59. March 1974.

universality of self-generated verbal mediators as a means of enhancing memory pro-
h Report #58. January 1974.

Research Report #57. December 1973.

31. J. Turnure & W. Charlesworth, D. Moores, J. Rynders, M. Horrobin, S. Samuels, & R. Wozni Association Symposium Papers. Occasional Paper #24. December 1973.

32. N. Buium. Interrogative types of parental speech to language learning children: a ling Report #56. December 1973.

33. D. Krus. An outline of the basic concepts of order analysis. Occasional Paper #23. Fe

34. D. Krus. Order analysis: A fortran program for generalizable multidimensional analysis Occasional Paper #22. November 1973.

35. W. Bart. The pseudo-problem of IQ. Occasional Paper #21. October 1973.

36. J. Turnure & M. Thurlow. Verbal elaboration and the enhancement of language abilities i The role of interrogative sentence-forms. Occasional Paper #20. October 1973.

37. P. Dahl, S. Samuels & T. Archwamety. A mastery based experimental program for teaching word recognition skills. Research Report #55. September 1973.

38. R. Riegel, F. Danner & L. Donnelly. Developmental trends in the generation and utilizat tions for recall by EMR and non-retarded children: The SORTS test. Research Report

39. R. Hoffmeister & D. Moores. The acquisition of specific reference in the linguistic syst deaf parents. Research Report #53. August 1973.

40. W. Bart & M. Smith. An interpretive framework of cognitive structures. Occasional Paper

41. C. Clark & J. Greco. MELDS (Minnesota Early Language Development Sequence) glossary of Occasional Paper #18. June 1973.

42. J. Turnure. Interrelations of orienting response, response latency and stimulus choice Research Report #52. May 1973.

43. S. Samuels & P. Dahl. Automaticity, reading and mental retardation. Occasional Paper #1

44. S. Samuels & P. Dahl. Relationships among IQ, learning ability, and reading achievement. May 1973.

45. N. Buium & J. Rynders. The early maternal linguistic environment of normal and Down's Sy learning children. Research Report #51. May 1973.

#57. December 1973.

lesworth, D. Moores, J. Rynders, M. Horrobin, S. Samuels, & R. Wozniak. American Psychological posium Papers. Occasional Paper #24. December 1973.

tive types of parental speech to language learning children: a linguistic universal? Research cember 1973.

of the basic concepts of order analysis. Occasional Paper #23. February 1974.

ysis: A fortran program for generalizable multidimensional analysis of binary data matrices. r #22. November 1973.

problem of IQ. Occasional Paper #21. October 1973.

low. Verbal elaboration and the enhancement of language abilities in the mentally retarded: errogative sentence-forms. Occasional Paper #20. October 1973.

T. Archwamety. A mastery based experimental program for teaching poor readers high speech skills. Research Report #55. September 1973.

& L. Donnelly. Developmental trends in the generation and utilization of associative rela- by EMR and non-retarded children: The SORTS test. Research Report #54. August 1973.

Moores. The acquisition of specific reference in the linguistic system of a deaf child of Research Report #53. August 1973.

An interpretive framework of cognitive structures. Occasional Paper #19. June 1973.

MELDS (Minnesota Early Language Development Sequence) glossary of rebuses and signs. #18. June 1973.

lations of orienting response, response latency and stimulus choice in children's learning. #52. May 1973.

Automaticity, reading and mental retardation. Occasional Paper #17. May 1973.

Relationships among IQ, learning ability, and reading achievement. Occasional Paper #16.

. The early maternal linguistic environment of normal and Down's Syndrome (Mongoloid) language Research Report #51. May 1973.

46. T. Archwamety & S. Samuels. A mastery based experimental program for teaching mentally re recognition and reading comprehension skills through use of hypothesis/test procedure May 1973.

47. W. Bart. The process of cognitive structure complexification. Research Report #49. Apri

48. B. Best. Classificatory development in deaf children: Research on language and cognitive Paper #15. April 1973.

49. R. Riegel, A. Taylor, & F. Danner. The effects of training in the use of grouping strateg memory capabilities of young EMR children. Research Report #48. April 1973.

50. J. Turnure & M. Thurlow. The latency of forward and backward association responses in an Research Report #47. March 1973.

51. R. Riegel & A. Taylor. Strategies in the classroom: A summer remedial program for young Occasional Paper #14. March 1973.

52. D. Moores. Early childhood special education for the hearing impaired. Occasional Paper

53. R. Riegel & A. Taylor. A comparison of conceptual strategies for grouping and rememberin mentally retarded and non-retarded children. Research Report #46. February 1973.

54. J. Rynders. Two basic considerations in utilizing mothers as tutors of their very young retarded children. Occasional Paper #12. January 1973.

55. R. Bruininks, J. Rynders & J. Gross. Social acceptance of mildly retarded pupils in reso classes. Research Report #45. January 1973.

56. J. Turnure & M. Thurlow. The effects of interrogative elaborations on the learning of no Research Report #44. January 1973. (Proceedings of the International Association f of Mental Deficiency, in press).

57. J. Turnure & S. Samuels. Attention and reading achievement in first grade boys and girls November 1972. (Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 29-32).

58. R. Riegel, A. Taylor, S. Clarren, & F. Danner. Training educationally handicapped childr grouping strategies for the organization and recall of categorizable materials. Res November 1972.

R. Riegel, F. Danner, & A. Taylor. Steps in sequence: Training educationally handicappe gies for learning. Development Report #2. November 1972.

uels. A mastery based experimental program for teaching mentally retarded children word reading comprehension skills through use of hypothesis/test procedures. Research Report #50.

of cognitive structure complexification. Research Report #49. April 1973.

ry development in deaf children: Research on language and cognitive development. Occasional 1973.

& F. Danner. The effects of training in the use of grouping strategy on the learning and les of young EMR children. Research Report #48. April 1973.

w. The latency of forward and backward association responses in an elaboration task. 47. March 1973.

Strategies in the classroom: A summer remedial program for young handicapped children. #14. March 1973.

ldhood special education for the hearing impaired. Occasional Paper #13. February 1973.

. A comparison of conceptual strategies for grouping and remembering employed by educable d and non-retarded children. Research Report #46. February 1973.

c considerations in utilizing mothers as tutors of their very young retarded or potentially n. Occasional Paper #12. January 1973.

ers & J. Gross. Social acceptance of mildly retarded pupils in resource rooms and regular ch Report #45. January 1973.

ow. The effects of interrogative elaborations on the learning of normal and EMR children. #44. January 1973. (Proceedings of the International Association for the Scientific Study ency, in press).

ls. Attention and reading achievement in first grade boys and girls. Research Report #43. (Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 29-32).

S. Clarren, & F. Danner. Training educationally handicapped children to use associative ies for the organization and recall of categorizable materials. Research Report #42.

A Taylor. Steps in sequence: Training educationally handicapped children to use strate- velopment Report #2. November 1972.

60. A. Taylor, M. Thurlow, & J. Turnure. The teacher's introduction to: The Math Vocabular Report #1. March 1973.

61. J. Turnure & M. Thurlow. The effects of structural variations in elaboration on learnin dren. Research Report #41. September 1972.

62. A. Taylor & N. Bender. Variations of strategy training and the recognition memory of EM #40. September 1972. (American Educational Research Journal, in press.)

63. D. Moores, C. McIntyre, & K. Weiss. Evaluation of programs for hearing impaired childre Research Report #39. September 1972.

64. R. Rubin. Follow-up of applicants for admission to graduate programs in special educati #11. July 1972.

65. D. Moores. Communication -- Some unanswered questions and some unquestioned answers. C July 1972.

66. A. Taylor & S. Whitely. Overt verbalization and the continued production of effective e dren. Research Report #38. June 1972. (American Journal of Mental Deficiency, in

67. R. Riegel. Measuring educationally handicapped children's organizational strategies by Research Report #37. May 1972.

68. E. Gallistel, M. Boyle, L. Curran, & M. Hawthorne. The relation of visual and auditory low readers' achievement under sight-word and systematic phonic instruction. Resea

69. E. Gallistel & P. Fischer. Decoding skills acquired by low readers taught in regular cl techniques. Research Report #35. May 1972.

70. J. Turnure & M. Thurlow. Verbal elaboration in children: Variations in procedures and March 1972.

71. D. Krus & W. Bart. An ordering-theoretic method of multidimensional scaling of items. 1972.

72. J. Turnure & S. Larsen. Effects of various instruction and reinforcement conditions on position oddity problem by nursery school children. Research Report #32. March 19

73. J. Turnure & S. Larsen. Outerdirectedness in mentally retarded children as a function o sex of subject. Research Report #31. March 1972.

w, & J. Turnure. The teacher's introduction to: The Math Vocabulary Program. Development ch 1973.

low. The effects of structural variations in elaboration on learning by normal and EMR chil- Report #41. September 1972.

r. Variations of strategy training and the recognition memory of EMR children. Research Report 1972. (American Educational Research Journal, in press.)

re, & K. Weiss. Evaluation of programs for hearing impaired children: Report of 1971-72. #39. September 1972.

of applicants for admission to graduate programs in special education. Occasional Paper

ation -- Some unanswered questions and some unquestioned answers. Occasional Paper #10.

ly. Overt verbalization and the continued production of effective elaborations by EMR chil- Report #38. June 1972. (American Journal of Mental Deficiency, in press.)

g educationally handicapped children's organizational strategies by sampling overt groupings. #37. May 1972.

le, L. Curran, & M. Hawthorne. The relation of visual and auditory aptitudes to first grade hievement under sight-word and systematic phonic instruction. Research Report #36. May 1972.

scher. Decoding skills acquired by low readers taught in regular classrooms using clinical search Report #35. May 1972.

low. Verbal elaboration in children: Variations in procedures and design. Research Report #34.

An ordering-theoretic method of multidimensional scaling of items. Research Report #33. March

en. Effects of various instruction and reinforcement conditions on the learning of a three- problem by nursery school children. Research Report #32. March 1972.

en. Outerdirectedness in mentally retarded children as a function of sex of experimenter and Research Report #31. March 1972.

74. J. Rynders & M. Horrobin. A mobile unit for delivering educational services to Down's Sy Research Report #30. January 1972. (Presented at Council for Exceptional Children ence, Memphis, December, 1971.)

75. F. Danner & A. Taylor. Pictures and relational imagery training in children's learning. December 1971. (Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, in press.)

76. J. Turnure & M. Thurlow. Verbal elaboration phenomena in nursery school children. Rese 1971. (Study II: Proceedings of 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychologic

77. D. Moores & C. McIntyre. Evaluation of programs for hearing impaired children: Progres Report #27. December 1971.

78. S. Samuels. Success and failure in learning to read: A critique of the research. Occa 1971. (In M. Kling, The Literature of Research in Reading with Emphasis on Modes,

79. S. Samuels. Attention and visual memory in reading acquisitions. Research Report #26.

80. J. Turnure & M. Thurlow. Verbal elaboration and the promotion of transfer of training i children. Research Report #25. November 1971. (Journal of Experimental Child Psy

81. A. Taylor, M. Josberger, & S. Whitely. Elaboration training and verbalization as factor children's recall. Research Report #24. October 1971. (Journal of Educational Ps

82. W. Bart & D. Krus. An ordering-theoretic method to determine hierarchies among items. September 1971.

83. A. Taylor, M. Josberger, & J. Knowlton. Mental elaboration and learning in retarded chi #22. September 1971. (Mental Elaboration and Learning in EMR children. American Deficiency, 1972, 77, 69-76.)

84. J. Turnure & S. Larsen. Outerdirectedness in educable mentally retarded boys and girls September 1971. (American Journal of Mental Deficiency, in press.)

85. R. Bruininks, T. Glaman, & C. Clark. Prevalency of learning disabilities: Findings, i Research Report #20. June 1971. (Presented at Council for Exceptional Children C April, 1971.)

86. M. Thurlow & J. Turnure. Mental elaboration and the extension of mediational research: phenomena in the mentally retarded. Research Report #19. June 1971. (Journal of Psychology, 1972, 14, 134-195.)

87. G. Siegel. Three approaches to speech retardation. Occasional Paper #8. May 1971.

in. A mobile unit for delivering educational services to Down's Syndrome (Mongoloid) infants. 30. January 1972. (Presented at Council for Exceptional Children, Special National Conference, December, 1971.)

Pictures and relational imagery training in children's learning. Research Report #29. (Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, in press.)

ow. Verbal elaboration phenomena in nursery school children. Research Report #28. December : Proceedings of 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1973, 83-84.)

re. Evaluation of programs for hearing impaired children: Progress report 1970-71. Research ember 1971.

and failure in learning to read: A critique of the research. Occasional Paper #9. November ing, The Literature of Research in Reading with Emphasis on Modes, Rutgers University, 1971.)

n and visual memory in reading acquisitions. Research Report #26. November 1971.

ow. Verbal elaboration and the promotion of transfer of training in educable mentally retarded rch Report #25. November 1971. (Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1973, 15, 137-148.)

er, & S. Whitely. Elaboration training and verbalization as factors facilitating retarded l. Research Report #24. October 1971. (Journal of Educational Psychology, in press.)

n ordering-theoretic method to determine hierarchies among items. Research Report #23.

er, & J. Knowlton. Mental elaboration and learning in retarded children. Research Report 1971. (Mental Elaboration and Learning in EMR children. American Journal of Mental , 77, 69-76.)

n. Outerdirectedness in educable mentally retarded boys and girls. Research Report #21. (American Journal of Mental Deficiency, in press.)

an, & C. Clark. Prevalency of learning disabilities: Findings, issues, and recommendations. #20. June 1971. (Presented at Council for Exceptional Children Convention, Miami Beach,

re. Mental elaboration and the extension of mediational research: List length of verbal e mentally retarded. Research Report #19. June 1971. (Journal of Experimental Child 14 134-195.)

es to speech retardation. Occasional Paper #8. May 1971.

88. D. Moores. An investigation of the psycholinguistic functioning of deaf adolescents. Re 1971. (Exceptional Children, 1970, 36, 645-652.)

89. D. Moores. Recent research on manual communication. Occasional Paper #7. April 1971. of Communication Disorders, Council for Exceptional Children Annual Convention, Mia

90. J. Turnure, S. Larsen, & M. Thurlow. Two studies on verbal elaboration in special popul brain injury; II. Evidence of transfer of training. Research Report #17. April 19 Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1973, 78, 70-76.)

91. R. Bruininks & J. Rynders. Alternatives to special class placement for educable mentall Occasional Paper #6. March 1971. (Focus on Exceptional Children, 1971, 3, 1-12.)

92. D. Moores. Neo-oralism and the education of the deaf in the Soviet Union. Occasional P (Exceptional Children, 1972, 39, 377-384.)

93. D. Feldman, B. Marrinan, & S. Hartfeldt. Unusualness, appropriateness, transformation a for creativity. Research Report #16. February 1971. (American Educational Researc ference, New York, February 1971.)

94. P. Broen & G. Siegel. Variations in normal speech disfluencies. Research Report #15. Speech, in press.)

95. D. Feldman. Map understanding as a possible crystallizer of cognitive structures. Occa 1971. (American Educational Research Journal, 1971, 3, 484-502.)

96. J. Rynders. Industrial arts for elementary mentally retarded children: An attempt to r Occasional Paper #3. January 1971.

97. D. Moores. Education of the deaf in the United States. Occasional Paper #2. November of Defectology, 1971, published in Russian.)

98. R. Bruininks & C. Clark. Auditory and learning in first-, third-, and fifth-grade child November 1970.

99. R. Bruininks & C. Clark. Auditory and visual learning in first grade educable mentally Research Report #13. November 1970. (American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1972,

100. R. Bruininks. Teaching word recognition to disadvantaged boys with variations in auditor abilities. Research Report #12. November 1970. (Journal of Learning Disabilities

R. Bruininks & W. Lucker. Change and stability in correlations between intelligence and among disadvantaged children. Research Report #11. October 1970. (Journal of Read 295-305.

tigation of the psycholinguistic functioning of deaf adolescents. Research Report #18. May
onal Children, 1970, 36, 645-652.)

esearch on manual communication.. Occasional Paper #7. April 1971. (Keynote Address, Division
n Disorders, Council for Exceptional Children Annual Convention, Miami Beach, April 1971.)

n, & M. Thurlow. Two studies on verbal elaboration in special populations. I. The effects of
I. Evidence of transfer of training. Research Report #17. April 1971. (Study I: American
al Deficiency, 1973, 78, 70-76.)

nders. Alternatives to special class placement for educable mentally retarded children.
r, #6. March 1971. (Focus on Exceptional Children, 1971, 3, 1-12.)

ism and the education of the deaf in the Soviet Union. Occasional Paper #5. February 1971.
ildren, 1972, 39, 377-384.)

nan, & S. Hartfeldt. Unusualness, appropriateness, transformation and condensation as criteria
Research Report #16. February 1971. (American Educational Research Association Annual Con-
rk, February 1971.)

. Variations in normal speech disfluencies. Research Report #15. January 1971. (Language &
s.)

erstanding as a possible crystallizer of cognitive structures. Occasional Paper #4. January
n Educational Research Journal, 1971, 3, 484-502.)

al arts for elementary mentally retarded children: An attempt to redefine and clarify goals.
#3. January 1971.

n of the deaf in the United States. Occasional Paper #2. November 1970. (Moscow Institute
1971, published in Russian.)

ark. Auditory and learning in first-, third-, and fifth-grade children. Research Report #14.

ark. Auditory and visual learning in first grade educable mentally retarded normal children.
#13. November 1970. (American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1972, 76, No. 5, 561-567.)

ng word recognition to disadvantaged boys with variations in auditory and visual perceptual
arch Report #12. November 1970. (Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1970, 3, 30-39.)

Change and stability in correlations between intelligence and reading test scores
ldren. Research Report #11. October 1970. (Journal of Reading Behavior, 1970, 2,

102. R. Rubin. Sex differences in effects of kindergarten attendance on development of school readiness and language skills. Research Report #10. October 1970. (Elementary School Journal, 72, No. 5, February, 1972.)

103. R. Rubin & B. Balow. Prevalence of school learning & behavior disorders in a longitudinal study population. Research Report #9. October 1970. (Exceptional Children, 1971, 38, 293-299.)

104. D. Feldman & J. Bratton. On the relativity of giftedness: An empirical study. Research Report #8. August 1970. (American Educational Research Annual Conference, New York, February 1971.)

105. J. Turnure, M. Thurlow, & S. Larsen. Syntactic elaboration in the learning & reversal of paired-associates by young children. Research Report #7. January 1971.

106. R. Martin & L. Berndt. The effects of time-out on stuttering in a 12-year-old boy. Research Report #6. July 1970. (Exceptional Children, 1970, 37, 303-304.)

107. J. Turnure & M. Walsh. The effects of varied levels of verbal mediation on the learning and reversal of paired associates by educable mentally retarded children. Research Report #5. June 1970. (Study I: American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1971, 76, 60-67. Study II: American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1971, 76, 306-312.)

108. J. Turnure, J. Rynders, & N. Jones. Effectiveness of manual guidance, modeling & trial and error learning for inducing instrumental behavior in institutionalized retardates. Research Report #4. June 1970. (Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1973, 19, 49-65.)

109. J. Turnure. Reactions to physical and social distractors by moderately retarded institutionalized children. Research Report #3. June 1970. (Journal of Special Education, 1970, 4, 283-294.)

110. D. Moores. Evaluation of preschool programs: An interaction analysis model. Occasional Paper #1. April 1970. (Keynote Address, Diagnostic Pedagogy, International Congress on Deafness. Stockholm, August 1970; also presented at American Instructors of the Deaf Annual Convention, St. Augustine, Florida, April 1970.

111. D. Feldman & W. Markwalder. Systematic scoring of ranked distractors for the assessment of Piagetian reasoning levels. Research Report #2. March 1970. (Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1971, 31, 347-362.)

112. D. Feldman. The fixed-sequence hypothesis: Individual differences in the development of school related spatial reasoning. Research Report #1. March 1970.